

THE <sup>K92</sup>  
2  
AMERICAN HISTORICAL  
REVIEW

*BOARD OF EDITORS*

GEORGE L. BURR  
EDWARD P. CHEYNEY  
J. FRANKLIN JAMESON

ANDREW C. McLAUGHLIN  
JAMES H. ROBINSON  
FREDERICK J. TURNER

*MANAGING EDITOR*

J. FRANKLIN JAMESON

VOLUME XIX

OCTOBER 1913 TO JULY 1914

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

LONDON: MACMILLAN AND CO., LTD.

1914

PRESS OF  
THE NEW ERA PRINTING COMPANY  
LANCASTER, PA.

# CONTENTS OF VOLUME XIX

NUMBER 1. OCTOBER, 1913

## ARTICLES

A. J. CARLYLE	The Sources of Medieval Political Theory and its Connection with Medieval Politics . . . . .	1
A. O. MEYER	Charles I. and Rome . . . . .	13
E. R. TURNER	The Development of the Cabinet, 1688-1760, II. . . . .	27
C. H. VAN TYNE	The Influence of the Clergy, and of Religious and Sectarian Forces, on the American Revolution . . . . .	44
J. G. RANDALL	Captured and Abandoned Property during the Civil War . . . . .	65
G. S. CALLENDER	The Position of American Economic History . . . . .	80
DOCUMENTS—Notes of Colonel W. G. Moore, Private Secretary to President Johnson, 1866-1868, contributed by Professor St. George L. Sioussat . . . . .		98
REVIEWS OF BOOKS . . . . .		133
COMMUNICATION . . . . .		181
NOTES AND NEWS . . . . .		182

NUMBER 2. JANUARY, 1914

## ARTICLES

W. A. DUNNING	Truth in History . . . . .	217
A. A. MACDONELL	The Early History of Caste . . . . .	230
G. H. ORPEN	The Effects of Norman Rule in Ireland, 1169-1333 . . . . .	245
W. E. LINGELBACH	Historical Investigation and the Commercial History of the Napoleonic Era . . . . .	257
C. A. BEARD	Some Economic Origins of the Jeffersonian Democracy . . . . .	282
DOCUMENTS—Journal of Jean Baptiste Truteau on the Upper Missouri, "Première Partie", June 7, 1794-March 26, 1795 . . . . .		299
REVIEWS OF BOOKS . . . . .		334
NOTES AND NEWS . . . . .		408

## NUMBER 3. APRIL, 1914

## ARTICLES

	The Meeting of the American Historical Association at Charleston and Columbia . . . . .	467
HENRI PIRENNE	The Stages in the Social History of Capitalism . . . . .	494
D. C. MUNRO	The Children's Crusade . . . . .	516
INNA LUBIMENKO	The Correspondence of Queen Elizabeth with the Russian Czars . . . . .	525
U. B. PHILLIPS	A Jamaica Slave Plantation . . . . .	543
DOCUMENTS—A New Plan to Govern Virginia, contributed by A. P. Newton . . . . .		559
REVIEWS OF BOOKS . . . . .		579
NOTES AND NEWS . . . . .		695

## NUMBER 4. JULY, 1914

## ARTICLES

A. B. WHITE	Some Early Instances of Concentration of Representatives in England . . . . .	735
A. L. CROSS	Legal Materials as Sources for the Study of Modern English History . . . . .	751
E. R. TURNER	Committees of Council and the Cabinet, 1660-1688 . . . . .	772
I. J. COX	General Wilkinson and his Later Intrigues with the Spaniards . . . . .	794
DOCUMENTS—Estimates of the Value of Slaves, 1815 . . . . .		813
REVIEWS OF BOOKS . . . . .		839
NOTES AND NEWS . . . . .		935
INDEX . . . . .		970



The  
American Historical Review

THE SOURCES OF MEDIEVAL POLITICAL THEORY  
AND ITS CONNECTION WITH MEDIEVAL  
POLITICS<sup>1</sup>

It is probably true to say, that to-day, after a century of serious historical study, the great majority of even educated people still think of the Middle Ages as a period when men were governed by strange and fantastic conceptions. It may indeed be doubted whether the progress of a real knowledge of the Middle Ages has been hindered more by the stupid and ignorant obscurantism of the Renaissance and the New Learning, or by the rather fatuous enthusiasm of the Romantic movement. For if the former treated medieval civilization as simply barbaric and irrational, the latter mistook the ridiculous play-acting of the first Gothic revival in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, with its grotesque orders of chivalry, for the genuine medieval world. No doubt we shall always have to give their due weight to aspects of medieval life which in the end were found impracticable, which could not be brought into line with the actual development of the civilization of the modern world, but I venture to think a great deal too much has been made of them, that we have tended to mistake some impracticable ideas of the Middle Ages for their real and governing principles.

This is notably the case with the conception of a universal empire, but not less with the conception of the supremacy of the spiritual over the temporal power. We can without difficulty recognize in the first, not only the survival of the tradition of the ancient empire, but a form of the perpetual aspiration to make real the dream of the universal commonwealth of humanity. We can all recognize without any difficulty that behind the impossible con-

<sup>1</sup> A paper read at the International Congress of Historical Studies, London, April, 1913.

ception of a papal supremacy over the Empire, there did lie the fundamental principle that the economic as well as the political methods of society must be controlled by the moral and spiritual principles of life. But we must make clear to ourselves that the terms in which these great ideals expressed themselves were not only of passing importance, but that these did not form the really significant elements in the political theory of the Middle Ages, any more than they determined the actual course of medieval politics. It is in the hope that it may be possible to help in directing the study of medieval ideas into its most fruitful channels that I venture to bring forward some observations upon the sources of the political theory of the Middle Ages.

It is obvious to any student of the learned, as distinguished from the artistic, literature of the Middle Ages, that it is to a great degree governed by the writings of the Christian Fathers. Not only in matters of theology, but in every region of thought the writing of the great Fathers exercised a dominant influence. But it is not always sufficiently understood what exactly this means. I do not deal with matters of pure theology, where no doubt the tradition of the Middle Ages is specifically though not exclusively Christian. When we examine the philosophical, and especially the political and social, ideas which are presented under terms supplied by the Fathers, we find that these do not in the first place represent a distinctively Christian tradition, but rather that, quite obviously and clearly, many of these conceptions are those which belonged to the later centuries of the ancient civilization, accommodated no doubt to Christian ideas, and often expressed in Christian phrases, but not, either in their origin or in their essential character, by any means distinctively Christian. And this is wholly natural. The great Fathers were Christian men, but they were also educated men of the Empire and their education was that of the other men of those centuries. No doubt their education differed considerably, as also their individual intellectual capacities, but it was the same education which all alike received. Some of them like Basil and the Cappadocian Fathers were students of first-rate universities such as that of Athens, while others were pupils of inferior schools, but always and everywhere they were primarily educated men of the Graeco-Roman civilization. And therefore it was natural and inevitable that except when the Christian tradition presented them with distinctively Christian conceptions, they should present in their writings the general principles of thought of the society in which they were educated.

We have often been misled by the fact that their mode of thought is very different from that of the great Greek philosophical writers of the fourth century before Christ, but the truth is that, by the first century before Christ, the philosophical conceptions of the ancient world had been in some very fundamental aspects completely changed, and it is the later centuries which the Christian Fathers represent. An inferior philosophy, the critics will say, and that is no doubt true, but not a philosophy to be neglected, for after all, as handed down by the Christian Fathers, it in some respects dominated political theory, not only in the Middle Ages, but till the end of the eighteenth century, and in some points the new social philosophy was actually greatly in advance of the older.

The first source then of the political theory of the Middle Ages is to be found in the philosophy and the commonplaces of the Empire. And if we try to select the most important of the general characteristics of this mode of thought, we shall find it in the distinction between Nature and Convention. To these thinkers, the great institutions of society, such as government, slavery, or property, were not natural, but conventional. They looked upon them as representing not the primitive characteristics of human nature—and to them the primitive was the natural—but as caused by the loss of man's original innocence. It will readily be understood how easily this fitted into the theological tradition of the Fall. Government, slavery, property, represent not the natural or essential characteristics of human nature, but necessary adjustments to its defects. By nature men were equal, and had no authority over each other, by nature men were free, by nature all things were common to all men, and private property was only a method by which organized society endeavored to restrain the intemperate cupidity and greed of men's vicious desires. These are the most fundamental sociological conceptions of the Fathers; they are not specifically Christian, but are the commonplaces of the schools of the Empire. It is these conceptions which furnish the framework of all medieval political theory. Whether we look at the canonists, or the schoolmen, or the civilians, or even the feudal lawyers, it is the contrast between Nature and Convention which meets us everywhere.

It was from the Middle Ages that these conceptions passed into the political and social theory of the Renaissance and the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. The conceptions of Natural Law, of the State of Nature, and so on, which are so important in the later writers, are medieval doctrines. It was not indeed till Rousseau in the *Contrat Social* restored the more organic conception

of the state, and till the beginnings of the historical criticism of institutions, that we began to recover the standpoint of the earlier Greek philosophy, and it may be said with some truth that the police theory of the state as it was represented in the English Radical tradition, and developed by Herbert Spencer, is simply a survival of this conception.

We may then be inclined to ask, whether there were no specifically Christian conceptions, presented by the Fathers and developed in the Middle Ages. There are, I think, two, which have exercised a great influence in the medieval and in the modern world.

The first is the conception of the divine character of political authority. We shall all remember the famous phrase of St. Paul, "Let every soul be in subjection to the higher powers: for there is no power but of God; and the powers that be are ordained of God." Great and fateful words; for they represent on the one side a most profound conception of the nature of political society, and on the other, they have been used as the foundation of the most curious perversion of the conception of authority known to the modern world. There can be little doubt as to what St. Paul meant. He had to correct certain anarchical tendencies in the Christian society which appeared in the apostolic churches, tendencies connected with the characteristic Pauline conception of the freedom of the sons of God from the bondage of the law, tendencies which have reappeared from time to time in Christian history, as for instance in the Anabaptism of the sixteenth century. St. Paul sought to correct these by asserting the function of the state as the minister of the divine justice. In certain of the great Fathers, especially in St. Gregory the Great, this conception was transformed into the doctrine of the absolute and unquestionable authority of the monarch. For St. Gregory interpreted these words under the influence of certain Oriental conceptions of monarchy, which find expression in some parts of the Old Testament, and especially in the Books of Samuel, where the "Lord's anointed" is conceived of as invested with something of a divine sanctity.<sup>2</sup> There are some traces of a tendency towards this view in some of the later classical writers, as for instance in Seneca's treatise *De Clementia*<sup>3</sup> and in the banal phrases of Horace's political odes. But I think that substantially this conception represents an Orientalism imported into the western world by some of the Christian Fathers; by some, I say, for it is clear that others, notably St. Ambrose and St. Isidore of

<sup>2</sup> Cf. St. Gregory the Great, *Libri Moralium*, XXII. 24; *Reg. Past.*, III. 4.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Seneca, *De Clementia*, I. 1-7.

Seville,<sup>4</sup> represent the true meaning of St. Paul's phrases. This perversion of St. Paul's principle, in spite of the great authority of St. Gregory the Great, has little importance in the Middle Ages, but with the appearance of the absolutist conception of sovereignty in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, it became important, and in the seventeenth century it played an important part in the most civilized of European countries, and it still survives to some extent in those European countries which lie toward the East.

The second great principle which may be called distinctively Christian, is the conception of the independence or autonomy of the spiritual or religious life. The conception of the distinction between Church and State, and of the independence of the religious society, has been developed under the influence of Christianity. It would indeed be a serious misconception, if we were to regard this as arising exclusively out of Christian principles. I think that it is clear that we have here an aspect of the influence exercised by that gradual apprehension of personality or individuality, which we can trace both in the later parts of the Old Testament and in the post-Aristotelian philosophical theory.

It would of course be impossible here to discuss seriously the significance of this new element in civilization. But I suppose that no student of the history of medieval and modern civilization can fail to see its immense importance. For men found themselves now under the control of two great systems of organization of life, subject to two systems of law, not one only, to two sets of authorities, not one only. The great conflict of Church and State in the Middle Ages cannot be seriously studied or justly interpreted unless we begin by recognizing the immense significance of the circumstances out of which it arose. I do not think there can be any doubt about the theory of Church and State which was normal in the Middle Ages, that is, that Church and State were each supreme in its own sphere, each derived from God, each justly claiming the obedience of its members in its own sphere, independent of each other within that sphere. It is however true that the definition of their respective spheres was a matter of infinite difficulty, and that each did in turn frequently come to exercise authority in the sphere of the other, and that finally this brought about the great conflict which filled Europe with clamor and confusion from the eleventh to the end of the thirteenth century. How far the claim to supremacy which was made in his later years by Hildebrand represented the normal principle, or the systematic policy of the papacy, I cannot here discuss.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. St. Ambrose, *Exp. S. Lucae*, IV. 5; St. Isidore of Seville, *Etym.*, IX. 3; *Sent.*, III. 47-52.

The problem of the relation of these two great aspects of human life was not settled in the Middle Ages, indeed it may very fairly be said that it has not been finally settled even in our time.

So far we have been considering some of those elements of medieval theory which belong to the tradition of the last centuries of the ancient world, as they were transmitted to the Middle Ages in the writings of the great Fathers. We must now consider some aspects of medieval theory, as they arose from the characteristics of the new societies, the new states, which grew up on the ruins of the Western Empire, and from the conditions under which these new political organizations took shape. That is, we must consider the principles implicit in the Teutonic constitutions and in the feudal organization of society. It would be absurd to attempt to trace in a few words the development of the constitutional machinery of medieval societies, but I think it is not impossible to say a few words about the ideas which are implicit in this process, and which came to expression in the political literature from the ninth to the thirteenth centuries.

The first great principle which seems to me to lie behind the whole structure of medieval society is this, that political authority is the authority of the whole community. The great representative machinery in which this was finally embodied, represents one of the greatest achievements of civilization, and is a perpetual monument of the practical political genius of the Middle Ages. This development would have been impossible, as its appearance would be unintelligible, if its foundations had not been laid deep in the principles of medieval society, and especially in the principle that all authority is the authority of the community. This principle is implicit in two great practical facts of medieval society, the first that law is the law of the community, the second that the administrative organs of the community, if we may use a modern phrase, derive their authority from the consent of the community.

I think that I shall have the assent of all students of medieval history when I say that the notion of a legislative authority vested in the king or emperor, so far as it exists at all, belongs only to the latest period of the Middle Ages, and may be traced in part at least to the appearance of new influences, with which I shall have to deal presently.

In the earlier Middle Ages it may indeed be said that there is no such thing as a legislative authority at all. The law of the community is strictly speaking nothing but the traditional custom of the community, and legislative acts are only declarations of custom.

As the changing conditions of medieval life made modifications of this necessary, and when finally new laws had to be made, such action was taken reluctantly and hesitatingly and could only be taken by the whole community. "Kings and the servants of the commonwealth have laws by which they must rule . . . they have the *capitula* of the Christian kings and their ancestors, which they lawfully promulgated with the general consent of their faithful people".<sup>5</sup> "Law is made by the consent of the people and the ordinance of the king".<sup>6</sup> These phrases of Hincmar and of the *Edictum Pistense* are not mere phrases, but do actually represent the principle of early medieval society. And when the draughtsmen of Edward I. audaciously appropriated the phrase of the Roman law, "*Quod omnes tangit, ab omnibus approbetur*",<sup>7</sup> they were only finding a convenient phrase under which they might express the fundamental principles of the developed constitutionalism of the thirteenth century.

The fact that the administrative organization of the community derives its authority from the consent of the whole community, is embodied in the rule that there is no succession to kingship or Empire without the consent of the community. It would I think be incorrect to take the elective method of the Empire as normally representing the succession to medieval kingship, but this would be much nearer the truth than to say that succession was a matter of strict hereditary right.

It is, I venture to think, out of this principle of the community as the source of authority that there arose in the Middle Ages that great conception whose significance we are now only beginning to understand, now that the controversy over the mere phrase has passed away, the conception of the authority of the ruler or administrator as resting upon a contract or agreement between the ruler and the people. The contractual theory, and the representative machinery of government, form the substance of the political inheritance of the modern world from the Middle Ages.

This principle may have been anticipated occasionally in ancient literature, as for instance in Plato's *Laws*,<sup>8</sup> but, as far as I can make out, the medieval and modern conception has no continuity with such isolated speculations. It does on the contrary seem to me quite clear that it arose out of the principles implicit in certain great institutions and ceremonies of the Middle Ages, and especially that it was implicit in the forms under which one ruler succeeded

<sup>5</sup> Hincmar of Rheims (ninth century), *De Ordine Palatii*, 8.

<sup>6</sup> *Edictum Pistense* (864 A. D.), 6.

<sup>7</sup> Summons to Parliament of archbishop and clergy, 1295 A. D.

<sup>8</sup> Plato, *Laws*, III. 684.



another. It is in the reciprocal oaths, of justice and the administration of the law on the one side, and of obedience on the other, that we have to find the source of the theory of an agreement or contract between the ruler and the ruled. When Manegold in the eleventh century urged that the ruler who behaves tyrannically is justly deposed because he has violated the *pactum* under which he was appointed,<sup>9</sup> he was only throwing into concrete phrase the principle which underlies the medieval conception of government. The true king is he who governs justly and according to law; if he ceases to do that, he has forfeited all claim to his authority.

It may seem paradoxical to say it, but I do not myself think it can be doubted that the contractual conception of authority which is implicit in the new constitutions, is also the fundamental principle which lies behind the developed feudal system. It is no doubt true that there are other elements in feudalism. Whether we attach importance to the tradition of the *comitatus* or follow M. Flach in his interesting theory of the blood-brotherhood, we shall recognize that in its earlier stages at least the feudal relation had been one of personal devotion and loyalty, and something of this element remained to the end, and is reflected especially in the epic poetry. But the feudalism of the law books is a very different thing. Even where the literary person would perhaps naturally look for the romantic element of medievalism, in the law books of the kingdom of Jerusalem, it is quite clear that the feudal relation was almost wholly a contractual one. The vassal was no doubt under obligation to render certain services to his lord, but only on the condition that the lord discharged his obligations to the vassal, and any failure to do this relieved the vassal from his obligations, and even imposed upon the whole body of the vassals the obligation of refusing service to the lord until he had fulfilled his duties.<sup>10</sup> And it is important to remember that it was the High Court, consisting of all those who held directly from the king, which was to decide in cases of dispute between the king and his vassals as to their respective right and duties.<sup>11</sup> The phrases are not the same as those of Manegold, but the principle is the same, and the principle is that all ordered society rests upon the agreement to observe and maintain the law.

Such then are the principles of the political theory of the Middle Ages which arose out of the traditions and conditions of medieval society, principles, that is, which belonged not to the inheritance

<sup>9</sup> Manegold, *Ad Geberhardum*, 30.

<sup>10</sup> *Assizes of Jerusalem*, Philip of Novara, 52.

<sup>11</sup> *Assizes of Jerusalem*, Jean d'Ibelin, 193; Philip of Novara, 47.



from the ancient world but were native to the Middle Ages. We have finally to ask how far these conceptions were modified by new influences which came with the revived study of the literary remains of antiquity, with the new systematic study of the Roman jurisprudence in the twelfth century, and with the recovery of the Aristotelian political theory in the thirteenth century.

In one respect the study of the Roman jurisprudence only confirmed the tradition of the Teutonic societies. For as the Bologna civilians understood the Roman jurisprudence there is one, and only one, ultimate source of civil law and that is the Roman people. If the emperor has legislative authority, it is only because the Roman people have conferred upon him this authority; his authority is that of a vicar of the people.<sup>12</sup> They draw out this particular judgment into a general principle, when they maintain that it is always the *Universitas* which makes laws for its members; the *Populus* or *Res publica* command in virtue of the authority of the *Universitas*.<sup>13</sup> The general principle of the nature of political authority is the same as that represented by the constitutional tradition of the Middle Ages. In the application of this general principle, however, there did arise among the civilians a theory of a new and revolutionary nature. For in the Roman jurisprudence the people have invested the emperor with their legislative authority, he was normally the legislator, and Justinian in one place at least claims that he was the sole legislator.<sup>14</sup> And some of the great civilians of Bologna maintained that the people had thus completely and finally parted with their authority, so that even their custom had lost its power of making and abrogating laws.<sup>15</sup> Here we have undoubtedly a new and revolutionary principle whose far-reaching consequences can only be properly studied in relation to the political developments of Europe from the fourteenth to the seventeenth centuries, a principle which has a very close relation to the rise of the absolutisms of the Renaissance. In the Middle Ages proper I do not think that it can be said that this principle exercised any large influence, and it must be remembered that some of the most famous of the Bologna doctors refused to recognize this conclusion as legitimate. Bulgarus and John Bassianus maintained the continuing authority of the custom of the Roman people, while Azo and Hugolinus bluntly denied that the Roman people had ever parted with their authority, in such a sense that they could not resume it.<sup>16</sup>

<sup>12</sup> Irnerius, *Summa Trecensis*, I. 14, 3; Placentinus, *Summa Institutionum*, I. 2.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Irnerius, *De Aequitate*, 2; Irnerius, *Glosses on Digest. Vetus*, Digest I. 3, 1; Bulgarus, *Comm. on Digest.*, L. 177, 176.

<sup>14</sup> *Cod.*, I. 14, §12: 3 and 4.

<sup>15</sup> Irnerius, *Gloss. on Dig.*, I. 3, 32; Placentinus, *Summa Inst.*, I. 2; Roger, *Summa Codicis*, I. 12.

<sup>16</sup> Azo, *Summa Codicis*, I. 14, 8; Hugolinus, *Distinctiones*, Dist. 148, 34.

It was not till the thirteenth century that the political theory of Aristotle as a whole was known to the medieval writers, that is, known directly; something of it they were acquainted with through Cicero and the Fathers. The influence of the Aristotelian *Politics* upon St. Thomas Aquinas was of great importance, and especially in that it led St. Thomas to repudiate the traditional philosophical and patriotic theory of government as conventional and not natural. St. Thomas following Aristotle maintained that political society is not a consequence of the Fall, a convention unnatural in itself intended to correct the consequences of men's vices, but on the contrary a natural institution arising out of the essential characteristics of human nature.<sup>17</sup> But this recovery of the profound organic conception of Aristotle had little influence beyond St. Thomas himself. The traditional theory of the conventional and mechanical character of political society was too firmly fixed to be shaken even by the immense influence of St. Thomas, and it continued to dominate European political theory until, as I have already said, the genius of Rousseau<sup>18</sup> finally restored to Europe the organic conception of the state.

This brief survey of the main sources of the political ideas of medieval society, will I think suffice to indicate that their conceptions were by no means homogeneous. For these conceptions in part represented the traditional and literary inheritance from the philosophical schools of the ancient world, in part the influence of Christianity, while in part they were related to the actual temper and the concrete facts of medieval society.

The speculative framework of medieval political theory was always the philosophical conception of the distinction between Nature and Convention. It is partly due to a defective apprehension of this fact that so many paradoxical phrases of these centuries have been misunderstood. When a medieval writer says of some institution that it has its origin in vice or sin, he does not mean that it is in itself vicious or sinful. He may be using his phrase controversially, to throw some discredit upon an institution with which for the moment he is at issue. But he does not really mean anything more than that it is an adjustment to the actually vicious or infirm nature of man and does not represent man's ideal character. How far this speculative framework was organically related to the substantial content of medieval political theory I cannot now consider. It was not till the thirteenth century that men attempted

<sup>17</sup> Cf. St. Thomas Aquinas, *De Regimine Principum*, I. 1; *Summa Theologica*, I. qu. 96, arts. 3 and 4.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Rousseau, *Contrat Social*, I. 8.

to form a system of political thought, and to deal with this question would require a detailed consideration of the political philosophy of the great schoolmen like St. Thomas Aquinas.

There is then one whole side of the political theory of the Middle Ages which may be thought to have little direct connection with the actual life and movement of the time. It is very different with some of its other elements, which seem to me to deserve consideration as representing new and permanently important elements of life as well as of theory. I should cite specially and before all others the principle of the independence of the moral and spiritual life as embodied in the Church, the new form of the conception of individuality or personality, and next the principle of the contractual nature of political society as embodying the conception of the supremacy of law and of the community as a whole, over all the organs of government. We have here conceptions which are organically related to the actual conditions and principles of medieval society.

The great conflict of Church and State, which was of such importance in the Middle Ages, did not indeed lead directly to any final solution of the relation between the individual and society: it would be impossible to state in any very precise terms the actual upshot of the great conflict which began with Hildebrand and ended with Boniface VIII., but the great struggle only assumed other forms and the principle of the autonomy of the spiritual life was triumphant in the modern system of toleration and religious equality. It may indeed be said that the great churchmen builded better than they themselves knew, for the whole meaning of the struggle was not to be apprehended till the Church itself realized that the independence of the spiritual life transcends the authority of even the religious society.

And again the contractual theory of political authority was in the Middle Ages no abstract speculation, but the embodiment of the vital principle of political liberty; the political societies of the Middle Ages were societies of free men. Men were content to claim that they should be governed by law, but that law was the expression both of the will and of the character of society. The community itself was the source of all political authority, and the ruler was God's representative because the community and its authority represented the divine ordinance.

In these principles we have the most important elements of the political life of modern civilization. The Middle Ages had clearly developed the conception of political liberty as being in its essence nothing else than the self-government of the community, and in the

thirteenth century this created for itself a permanent form in the method of representative government. It has taken six centuries to develop this into the normal working system of civilized society, but the principle on which it rests and the machinery through which the principle works, and through which alone, so far as I can see, it ever can work, were apprehended and developed in the Middle Ages.

It is however true that this method of political liberty would be of very little significance if it were not controlled by the principle of individual or personal liberty. It is the main task of modern civilization to make this also real, to secure the freedom of the individual life, to emancipate the infinite varieties of personality. In the Middle Ages this was represented by the great principle of the freedom of the spiritual society, the principle that there are elements in human life which stand and must forever stand outside of the control of the political organization. The apprehension of this principle was no doubt incomplete, but in itself it was vital and has proved triumphant even over the forms which once protected it.

The modern world is very different from the medieval world, but it is continuous with it: the forms of its life and thought may at first sight seem to us strange and unfamiliar, but as we look more closely we see the human spirit living and making its way through the vast and complex tangle of life, and this spectacle is one which may well teach us respect for the past, patience with the present, and hope for the future.

ALEXANDER J. CARLYLE.

## CHARLES I. AND ROME<sup>1</sup>

THE relations between Charles I. of England and the Church of Rome are of only secondary importance for our understanding of the dominating problems of that time. For in the seventeenth century the conflict was no longer between Roman Catholic and Anglican, as in the time of Elizabeth, but between Anglican and Puritan. Still, the study of the relations between the Anglican king and the papal see is of interest in more than one respect. It helps us to understand, not only the religious ideas, but the whole mentality of Charles I. The history of these relations reveals to us, better perhaps than anything else, how much Charles was a stranger to the majority of his own people, and how little he understood the age in which he lived. And we learn that he was a stranger to the English people, not only on account of his ideas of state and church government, but also, as a whole, on account of his different ideals of culture. His culture was as predominantly aesthetical, as that of the Puritans was predominantly ethical. It can hardly be denied that these contrasted ideals of culture, of which we see the best evidence in the history of Charles's relations to Rome, were also racial ones. Charles I. was of mixed race; but the characteristics of the Latin race predominated in him. He had the Latin mind.

If we try to give Charles I. a place in the history of English civilization, we most correctly rank him as belonging to that cultural movement which may briefly be described as Italianizing. It is true, he never saw Italy; but still, he may be looked upon, in a way, as the culminating point of Italian influence in England.

A few words will suffice to characterize the movement, which is well known in its outlines and importance.<sup>2</sup> It commenced among the learned circles, in the time of Duke Humphrey of Gloucester, son of Henry IV., when England began to take her share in the revival of classical studies. It extended to the sphere of poetry, when Sir Thomas Wyatt and Henry earl of Surrey wrote their sonnets in the Italian style, and when no higher title of honor could

<sup>1</sup> A paper read at the International Historical Congress in London on April 8, 1913. Its argument is mainly based upon unprinted records in the Vatican Library. I have not deemed it necessary to give full references in every single case, as I shall have to deal at large with the same subject in the second volume of my book, *England und die Katholische Kirche* (vol. I., Rome, 1911).

The dates are given according to the new style, unless otherwise specified.

<sup>2</sup> See Lewis Einstein, *The Italian Renaissance in England* (New York, 1902).

be awarded to Edmund Spenser than that of the English Petrarch. It further extended to the habits and tastes of daily life, to the embellishment of houses and gardens, to the fashions in dress, to the manners of eating and drinking, to games and sports, etc. It has often been mentioned, how the "Italianate Englishman" became the object of reproach to all friends of native manners, and how the influence of Italy was considered by the Puritan party a national, a religious, and a moral danger to their country.

It was in this atmosphere of Italianizing culture that the delicate and impressionable mind of Prince Charles began to be formed. His mother, Queen Anne, was the patron of the study of the Italian language in English court society. John Florio dedicated to her his Anglo-Italian dictionary, with a flattering sonnet.<sup>3</sup> The queen made her children also learn Italian,<sup>4</sup> and through her young Charles was first imbued with that fatal predilection for Italian culture which in the future helped to widen the cleavage between the king and the people. There was then, and there is up to the present day, an invisible chain, the first link of which is aestheticism, the second Italy, and the last Roman Catholicism. Everyone knows from history, many a one also from personal observation, numerous instances of a mental development that goes through these three phases, beginning with an excessive appreciation of aesthetic culture, and ending with conversion to Rome. Now the Puritans, who hated Rome, with the keen insight of hatred mistrusted the first two links of the chain, the cult of beauty and the cult of Italy.

Queen Anne, it seems, was the first instance of this alleged mental development. I say "it seems", because we merely know the facts: that she was fond of art and of all that made life beautiful and brilliant; that she entertained a strong predilection for Italy; and that she was secretly converted to the Roman Church.<sup>5</sup> These facts we know, but not whether there is a causal connexion between them or not.

We are better informed about the mental disposition and development of her son. It cannot be said, it is true, that aesthetics were the medium through which the king approached the Church of Rome. But we shall see that the sympathy which he already felt

<sup>3</sup> John Florio, *Queen Anna's New World of Words, or a Dictionarie of the Italian and English Tongues* (London, 1611).

<sup>4</sup> "Possiede ancora la nostra lingua e procura che la imparino e possiedano parimente i figliuoli." Bentivoglio, *Relatione d'Inghilterra*. Vatican Archives, Borghese I. 190, fol. 8.

<sup>5</sup> Probably in 1601. There is no longer any room for doubt with regard to her conversion, the evidence being given in two of the queen's own letters. See *Quellen und Forschungen aus Italienischen Archiven*, VII. 301 (Rome, 1904); *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, XX. 126 (1905); cf. III. 795; IV. 110.

and which was mainly founded on religious sentiment grew stronger, as the king, in pursuing his artistic tendencies, became aware of a pronounced mental affinity between himself and the actual leaders of the Catholic Church.

Love of art and interest in theology were undoubtedly the main features of Charles's intellectual character. A patronage of the fine arts, such as he exercised, has been and is unequalled for connoisseurship in the annals of English history.<sup>6</sup> He is not so singular in his love for theology. It was the heirloom from his learned father and the fruit of his early education. The prince was trained, almost from the cradle,<sup>7</sup> in religious controversy, and he never lost his delight in it. The grand almoner of Queen Henrietta Maria reports that on every occasion the king encouraged disputations between him and Anglican ministers.<sup>8</sup> The letters of Gregorio Panzani, of George Conn, of Count Rossetti, the papal agents resident with the queen from 1634 to 1641, contain many detailed accounts of religious disputations with the king himself.<sup>9</sup> They are, indeed, by far the most important source for our knowledge of the king's religious ideas in the prime of his life, during the "happy days", before the storm came. It is especially this time, the period of Charles's personal government, with which I am concerned in this paper. Before that time, the mind of Charles was not fully developed, and during the Civil War he was no longer unfettered and sincere in the expression of his real sentiments. The period of 1630-1640 is the most important, therefore, for our study of the view taken by Charles of the Church of Rome.

I shall consider first and mainly, in what respect Charles sympathized with the Catholic Church, and where he deviated from it. I propose afterwards to sketch briefly the political consequences which flowed from this sympathy of the king for Rome.

When asked by George Conn as to his faith, the king professed to believe in the decrees of the first four oecumenical councils and the three ancient creeds.<sup>10</sup> Indeed, he insisted on the importance of studying the ancient fathers at the universities, as being more im-

<sup>6</sup> See Claude Phillips, "The Picture Gallery of Charles I.", in *The Portfolio* (London, 1896).

<sup>7</sup> "Erat ab incunabulis a rege Jacobo patre educatus in controversiis qui hunc praeferere ecclesiae Cantuariensi certo statuerat apud se, si princeps Henricus primogenitus superstes fuisset." Report of Fr. Aegidius Chaiffy (?) to the cardinals of the Propaganda, Oct. 28, 1653. Archives of the Propaganda, Scritture Originali, vol. 297, fol. 194.

<sup>8</sup> *L. c.*

<sup>9</sup> They are preserved in the Barberiniana of the Vatican Library. Transcripts are in the Public Record Office, London.

<sup>10</sup> Conn to Cardinal Barberini, Jan. 29, 1638. Vat. Library, Barb. 8642, fol. 59 v.



portant than the modern writers.<sup>11</sup> Still, in refusing to acknowledge the later councils, especially that of Trent, he held the general Protestant view. Though he did not believe in the supremacy of the pope, he strongly objected to the title assumed by Henry VIII. of "Supreme Head of the Church of England".<sup>12</sup> His objection was founded not on arguments of *political* expediency, as was the case with Queen Elizabeth, who modified the title into "Supreme Governor", but merely on his *religious* horror of schism. For the king was convinced that he was a Catholic. "I do not admit that I am a schismatic", he once remarked to Conn.<sup>13</sup> Another time, smilingly, "With your kind permission, I too belong to the Catholic Church."<sup>14</sup> Again, he said, one day, complaining, but laughing at the same time, "You cannot get used to call me a Catholic."<sup>15</sup> With more seriousness he insisted at another conversation, "My dear friend, I *am* a Catholic"; Conn answered, "None could wish it more than I." The queen's mother (Marie de' Medici), who was present, interposed, "One must be an Apostolic Roman Catholic." Whereupon the king replied, "You ladies will not understand me, but he [Conn] will: Est implicantia in adjecto".<sup>16</sup>

The king, we see, used the word Catholic, as Anglicans then did and do now, in the original sense of all-embracing, universal, and therefore understood by Catholic Church the whole body of orthodox Christians.<sup>17</sup>

It was in the same sense, that, for instance, Chillingworth dedicated his *Religion of Protestants* to the king, as "a tender-hearted and compassionate son towards your distressed mother, the *Catholic Church*". The combination "Roman Catholic" appealed to Charles as an illogical conception, as a contradiction in terms. He would probably have objected as much to the modern term of Anglo-Catholic.

The king's conviction that he was wronged by being called a schismatic was founded on his belief that he belonged to an ecclesi-

<sup>11</sup> Panzani to Barberini, March 16, 1635. Barb. 8633, fol. 246 seq.

<sup>12</sup> Conn to Barberini, March 19, 1637. Barb. 8640, fol. 194.

<sup>13</sup> Conn to Barberini, Jan. 7, 1639. Barb. 8644, fol. 9 v.

<sup>14</sup> Conn to Barberini, Oct. 9, 1636. Barb. 8639, fol. 130.

<sup>15</sup> Conn to Barberini, Oct. 15, 1636. Barb. 8639, fol. 142.

<sup>16</sup> Conn to Barberini, Dec. 3, 1638. Barb. 8643, fol. 210.

<sup>17</sup> Here, as elsewhere, Charles was the true disciple of his father, who defended this idea of Catholicism on the very same lines against Cardinal du Perron, as Charles did against Conn. James I. held belief in the Scripture and ancient doctrine a sufficient test of Catholicism (as did Charles I.), while Cardinal du Perron insisted that *le nom de Catholique n'est pas un nom de simple créance, mais de communion* (thus agreeing with Conn). See *Lettre de Mons. le Card. du Perron envoyée au Sieur Casaubon* (Paris, 1612), p. 7; *Isaaci Casauboni Ad Epistolam Ill. et Rev. Card. Perronii Responsio* (London, 1612), pp. 10, 20.



astical community within which salvation was possible. But although he considered the Church of England just as much as the Church of Rome to be a way of salvation, it still was his innermost wish to help forward the restoration of unity among the different branches of the Church. With all his personal delight in private controversy on theological questions the king disliked Chelsea College, his father's foundation for carrying on controversy against Romanism. "Instead of studying controversies", he said, with regard to it, "one should rather work for union."<sup>18</sup>

In the first place, he naturally wanted to bring about union in England. But to him, unity at home was only a stepping-stone to universal union. "At the price of my blood", he once swore to Conn, "I wish we were united."<sup>19</sup> Again: "In order to remove schism, I should suffer any corporal penance, but the Roman Church is too rigid in some things, as for example in upholding the decrees of Trent."<sup>20</sup> When Conn suggested arranging a disputation, Charles replied mysteriously, "The time has not come yet, things are not yet ripe. We must look forward and say nothing."<sup>21</sup>

It would be quite a mistake to doubt the sincerity and disinterestedness of the king's wish for union with Rome. King James, it is true, before his accession to the English throne, held out hopes of conversion to the pope, in order to secure his moral support with the English Catholics.<sup>22</sup> Charles had no reason to act in like manner. Indeed, it occurred to him that friendly relations to Rome might be useful for obtaining the restoration of the Palatinate, and he made it appear that in return for this he would give liberty of conscience to his Roman Catholic subjects.<sup>23</sup> But he never allowed this political consideration to affect his conception of union with Rome, to say nothing of his own conversion.

If Charles had intended to deceive the pope about his real opinion, as his father had done, he would not have pointed as frankly as he did to the reasons which stood in the way of his conversion. These difficulties, as we shall see later, were not so much connected with matters of doctrine, ritual, or church government, but had rather reference to the king's personal sense of honor and morality.

Charles knew thoroughly well the doctrine and discipline of the

<sup>18</sup> Panzani to Barberini, Sept. 30, 1636. Barb. 8637, fol. 285.

<sup>19</sup> Conn to Barberini, May 15, 1637. Barb. 8640, fol. 304.

<sup>20</sup> Conn to Barberini, March 12, 1637. Barb. 8640, fol. 184.

<sup>21</sup> *L. c.*

<sup>22</sup> See my article "Clemens VIII. und Jakob I.", in *Quellen und Forschungen aus Italienischen Archiven*, VII. (Rome, 1904).

<sup>23</sup> Panzani to Barberini, Aug. 25, 1636. Barb. 8637, fol. 244.

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XIX.—2.

Church of Rome, and in many points he agreed with both of them. When one day he corrected the popular Protestant view by declaring that an indulgence was not for remission of sin, but for remission of the (temporal) penalty due to sin, he added: "I myself believe that there is such a power in the Church and that it has been usurped by the popes."<sup>24</sup> The king believed very strongly in the importance of confession—a favorite topic with him in his conversation at dinner, and frequently dealt with in the sermons preached in the king's presence.<sup>25</sup> He would emphasize its importance for the moral discipline of men, and he set the example of going to confession himself. It is curious that his belief in the value of confession made him also an advocate of celibacy of the clergy: a married father confessor, he was afraid, would not keep the seal of the confessional.<sup>26</sup> It was the same argument in favor of moral discipline that made the king wish for the introduction of the Inquisition all over Christendom: it would be useful, he said, for checking men's tongues and pens.<sup>27</sup>

Some further points in which the king approached Catholicism may be touched upon. He was in sympathy with the cult of relics: when a piece of the Holy Cross was once found in the Tower and the queen asked him to give it to her, he answered that he would keep it, because he paid it no less veneration than she did.<sup>28</sup> He was in favor of the veneration of images, and he once sent to Spain for a crucifix. He believed in saints and in miracles, though he objected to the abundance of fables in the legends of saints<sup>29</sup> and to the excessive cult of the Virgin. When in Spain, while paying court to the Infanta, he was shocked by seeing that the people knelt to the Madonna, while they only bowed to the crucifix.<sup>30</sup> To conclude, the king strictly kept the fasts and made a point of giving to the poor what was saved from the royal expenditure by the reduction of food.<sup>31</sup>

Having so many points of contact with Rome, the king naturally felt that there was no essential difference between the Thirty-Nine Articles and the Roman Catholic creed. This point was therefore often made the subject of sermons in the chapel royal.<sup>32</sup> It is also the leading idea of a book, published in 1634, which was perhaps

<sup>24</sup> Avvisi da Londra, May 6, 1633. Barb. 8671, no. 59.

<sup>25</sup> See Panzani's and Conn's letters, *passim*.

<sup>26</sup> Rossetti to Barberini, Apr. 6, 1640. Barb. 8647, fol. 93 *seq.*

<sup>27</sup> Avvisi da Londra, May 6, 1633. Barb. 8671, no. 59.

<sup>28</sup> Panzani to Barberini, Feb. 27, 1636. Barb. 8636, fol. 134.

<sup>29</sup> Conn to Barberini, May 1, 1637. Barb. 8640, fol. 267.

<sup>30</sup> Conn to Barberini, Jan. 15, 1637. Barb. 8640, fol. 53.

<sup>31</sup> Conn to Barberini, Nov. 20, 1636. Barb. 8639, fol. 215.

<sup>32</sup> Avvisi da Londra, Oct. 7, 1633. Barb. 8671, no. 63.

more to the taste of the king than any other book written during his reign. Its author was a convert, Franciscus a Sancta Clara, in the world Christopher Davenport, brother of New England's John Davenport. Its title runs *Deus, Natura, Gratia, sive Tractatus de Praedestinatione*, etc. This book, which is dedicated to the king, bears on its title-page the motto: "Non habent Dei charitatem qui Ecclesiae non diligunt unitatem." Much learning and still more dialectical skill are employed to explain away all differences between the two creeds. Even the declaration of the 37th Article, that the pope has no jurisdiction in this realm, loses its point by the surprising suggestion that it probably refers merely to the feudal suzerainty claimed by the pope in the time of King John. It is admitted, however, that another interpretation is possible, and in the end the question is left open.

Now this book, this brilliant apology of the king's fondest wish, was censured at Rome. Sir Francis Windebank, the secretary of state, who was appointed to negotiate with Pānzani concerning the union, was completely upset when he heard the news.<sup>33</sup> He who knew the king's mind best in this respect, and who shared the principles of his master, thought all was lost. It is true, Charles was deeply indignant, but he was too tenacious of the ideals he had once adopted as the right ones, to be disillusioned by this experience. He could not bring himself to see (what Archbishop Laud had told him from the outset) that Rome would never meet him half-way, but that everybody who was desirous of reconciliation had to go the whole length of the way to Rome.

Here we touch the point where, if I am right, the king saw the main obstacle to the cherished idea of union. Not so much religion, as honor, forbade him to accept a union which was not the result of mutual concessions. He often declared it dishonorable to change one's religion, as every Christian might be saved in his own.<sup>34</sup> The demand simply to submit to Rome was felt by him to be an affront to his present religion, which he thought excellent, because sufficient for salvation.<sup>35</sup> He therefore expected Rome to yield in some points, such as communion in both kinds, mass in English, marriage of priests (he wished to make celibacy compulsory for bishops only), and some other things.<sup>36</sup> He demanded these things not because he believed them to be the only right things, but

<sup>33</sup> Panzani to Barberini, Apr. 9, July 8, 1636. Barb. 8636, fol. 246; 8637, fol. 192 v.

<sup>34</sup> Status catholicae religionis in Anglia circa finem anni 1632. Barb. 8671, no. 52.

<sup>35</sup> Panzani to Barberini, June 27, 1636. Barb. 8637, fol. 151.

<sup>36</sup> Panzani to Barberini, March 9, 1635. Barb. 8633, fol. 216 seq.; cf. 8634, fol. 20 seq.

because, for the sake of his honor, he wanted Rome to make some advances to the Church of England. "You must induce the Pope to meet me half way", he plainly told Conn one day. Whereupon he got the clever reply: "His Holiness will even come up to London, to receive you into the Catholic Church."<sup>37</sup>

There is another point where the king thought his honor involved. He required the pope to relinquish his pretended power of deposing heretical princes.<sup>38</sup> There was not the slightest possible chance of the pope using his power against Charles. And Cardinal Barberini authorized Conn to assure the king that the pope would use his power neither against him nor his successors.<sup>39</sup> But Charles wanted more, the formal renunciation by the pope of the deposing power as a matter of principle. And this could not be granted. Barberini wrote to Conn: "Either the popes have the deposing power or they have not. If they have not, a discussion is superfluous. If they have, they cannot relinquish it, even if they wished, because in that case they would cease to be popes."<sup>40</sup>

The demand of Charles, however unacceptable to Rome, still did not go so far as King James's famous oath of allegiance.<sup>41</sup> For in this oath the English Catholics were asked not only to declare that the pope had no authority to depose the king, but also, that they abjured as impious and *heretical* this damnable doctrine that princes excommunicated by the pope may be deposed. This form of abjuration interfered with the Roman Catholic doctrinal system. It is part of the Church, not of the individual Catholic, to denounce a doctrine as heretical. And there was no possible chance that the Church would declare the doctrine of the pope's deposing power to be heretical. The utmost that could be expected was a tacit acquiescence in the fact that the English Catholics did not acknowledge the doctrine of the pope's deposing power.

King Charles was unprejudiced enough to see that this oath of allegiance was unfair. When asked by Conn to alter it, he proposed another form, according to which the Catholic subject vowed unconditional fidelity to the king and promised to defend him against every enemy at home or abroad, against all invasion, *deposition*, rebellion, etc., attempted by any prince, *priest*, or people.<sup>42</sup> The king meant to do his best, and it was only after long hesitation that he could be induced at all to think of altering the oath made

<sup>37</sup> Conn to Barberini, Aug. 14, 1637. Barb. 8641, fol. 62.

<sup>38</sup> *L. c.* and frequently *passim*.

<sup>39</sup> Barberini to Conn, Nov. 28, 1636. Barb. 8639, fol. 234.

<sup>40</sup> Jan. 8, 1637. Barb. 8640, fols. 35 v., 36.

<sup>41</sup> Introduced after the Gunpowder Plot by 3 Jac. I. c. 4, §9. See also Dodd's *Church History* (ed. Tierney), IV. cxviii (1841).

<sup>42</sup> Conn sent the form to Rome, Dec. 11, 1636. Barb. 8639, fols. 265, 268.

by Parliament. With all this Conn was not satisfied; he objected to the two words *deposition* and *priest*. Cardinal Barberini at once acceded to Conn's objections. Not even this new instance of refusing compliance on the side of Rome opened the king's eyes to the inflexibility of the system. He went on forming new oaths,<sup>43</sup> with the same result. No allusion to church and religion was allowed to stand, if the oath was to receive the tacit approbation of Rome. Instead of words like "prince or priest" the cardinal demanded "any prince whosoever". Instead of the clause "under pretence of religion", which referred to possible attacks on the king, the cardinal required "under pretence of public welfare or any other".<sup>43</sup>

With all the willingness of Charles to meet the pope more than half-way, the negotiations with regard to the oath yielded no result. Only on the very eve of the Civil War, in 1639, the king found favor in the eyes of the papal agent: the oath which was then offered to all members of the army contained no objectionable words, except, perhaps, the closing paragraph, "from which [oath] I hold no power on earth can absolve me in any part". Conn recommended the cardinal to connive at this sentence;<sup>44</sup> the theologians of the Curia, however, refused even this.<sup>45</sup>

During the whole of this and many other transactions between Charles I. and Conn, nothing seems more remarkable than the infinite patience and pliability of the king. The king endured every sort of contradiction from Conn, he never used a word like *papist*, then universally adopted by the language of the day, and he showed no sign of anger, when Conn applied the terms of *heretic* or *schismatic* to the non-Roman Catholics of England, as indeed the papal agent continually did. Conn writes at one time: "I have dealt on religion with the king in a manner that, if he were not such a good prince, I should rather have lost my head than gained his good graces."<sup>46</sup>

This forbearance contrasts strangely with the king's ordinary jealousy of his royal dignity. A language so frank and firm as Conn's the king would never, at the time of his personal government,<sup>47</sup> have condoned in a discussion about the merits and demerits

<sup>43</sup> Barberini to Conn, March 12, 1637. Barb. 8640, fol. 172.

<sup>44</sup> Conn to Barberini, May 6, 1639. Barb. 8644, fols. 211, 217.

<sup>45</sup> Barberini to Conn, June 25, 1639. Barb. 8644, fol. 291.

<sup>46</sup> Conn to Barberini, Oct. 15, 1636. Barb. 8639, fol. 144.

<sup>47</sup> It is true, Charles was very gentle and tolerant of contradiction when discussing the problem of church government with the Presbyterian divine, Alexander Henderson (see *The Papers which passed at New-Castle betwixt His Sacred Majesty and Mr Al. Henderson*, London, 1649); but this correspondence took place in 1646, when Charles was a captive.

of Episcopalian or Presbyterian church government. He would then have plainly refused any sort of discussion on that subject. For his natural feeling towards those who differed from him in their opinion was repugnance and contempt. If he showed indulgence with regard to the differences between himself and Conn, it was because he felt himself drawn to the system which was represented by the agent.

And George Conn, diplomatist as he was with all his seeming boldness, never lost an opportunity of bringing home to the king his affinity with Rome. It was only natural that he repeatedly assured the king that he was superior to Parliament, in his own opinion and in that of all Catholics. For a policy that aimed at improving the position of Catholics was incompatible with the acknowledgment of parliamentary prerogative. But Conn also, and almost continually, touched upon other and more delicate strings in the king's soul. He became the adviser and companion of Charles in his patronage of the fine arts. He would occasionally show the king a fine cameo or a picture, or such like, and if the king liked it, would offer it as a present.<sup>48</sup> He would induce Cardinal Barberini to make similar and more costly presents, or to negotiate the king's often difficult purchases of statues and pictures in Italy. At times the cardinal sent half a dozen, and more, works of renowned Italian painters—Lionardo, Veronese, Correggio, Andrea del Sarto, and other names occur among them. Lord Cottington, the chancellor of the exchequer, and Sir Francis Windebank, the secretary of state, both Romanizing in religion and Italianizing in taste for art, sometimes shared in these princely gifts.

Often Conn would look at the collections of the king and talk with him on art. The king evidently enjoyed his conversation far more than business. One day, at the feast of the Garter, when Charles was taking his friend over his picture gallery, he was so absorbed in it that he did not regard repeated messages that the knights were ready and waiting in full robes. There were some Puritans present who could hardly conceal their indignation at the king's cordiality with the pope's emissary.<sup>49</sup> It is a scene, I think, peculiarly characteristic both of Conn's position at court, and of the unrivalled pre-eminence which art had in the king's mind. Rather than to break off a talk over pictures, he would fail in courtesy towards the first noblemen of his realm. The king seems to have considered that only those were his equals who knew something of art. And the more dissatisfaction he found in the world of reali-

<sup>48</sup> Conn to Barberini, Oct. 9, 1636. Barb. 8639, fol. 118, and frequently elsewhere.

<sup>49</sup> Conn to Barberini, May 1, 1637. Barb. 8640, fol. 266.

ties, the more willingly he took flight to the sanctuary of art. The arrival of a picture or a statue from Italy was an event of far greater interest to him than the news of a battle in the Thirty Years' War, or the warning of civil strife at home. He had that aristocratic gift of putting aside and dismissing from his mind whatever hurt his feelings, and of cultivating his own individuality.

Now there was nobody who appreciated this individuality better than George Conn, and thanks to him, Pope Urban VIII. and Cardinal Barberini. No more exquisite compliment was ever devised for King Charles than that which Urban paid him by allowing Bernini to make his bust.<sup>50</sup> It is practically the only bust made by Bernini of a prince not belonging to the Church of Rome. Encouraged by Cardinal Barberini, the great artist did his best, having before him Van Dyke's picture (now at Windsor) which shows the head of Charles in three positions. The delight of the king and queen when they saw the bust was boundless.<sup>51</sup>

Panzani, in one of his letters, speaks of "una certa simpatia che ha con Roma questo regno". Indeed, Panzani did not know the *regno*, he merely knew the royal court, and with regard to it the sentence is right. But the only field on which this sympathy grew into perfect harmony was the field of aesthetic culture. Here the two crowned patrons of art, the pope and the king, understood one another thoroughly well. And is it a mere accident that the only peer of the realm whose artistic nature equalled the king's, the Earl of Arundel, was a Roman Catholic? It would have been in vain for Charles to look for appreciative companions among the heads of the Puritan party.

The feeling of being understood in what he loved best, the feeling of an affinity in culture with Rome, was evidently stronger with Charles than an occasional distrust of Roman Catholic morals. Once or twice he pointed out to Conn the "indigestible" doctrines, that their priests could absolve from oaths, and that faith need not be kept with heretics.<sup>52</sup> He was also inclined to think that, under

<sup>50</sup> Panzani to Barberini, June 13, 1635. Barb. 8634, fol. 114.

<sup>51</sup> The bust was executed during the winter of 1636-1637, was embarked at Civitavecchia in April, 1637, and arrived in England in July, not "early in 1638" as Lionel Cust supposes (*Notes on Pictures in the Royal Collections*, London, 1911, p. 79). Some doubts which are entertained by Mr. Cust in regard to the dates in the early history of this memorable bust may be easily removed by the evidence given in the correspondence between Cardinal Barberini and George Conn. See especially Barberini to Conn, Apr. 27, 1637 (Barb. 8640, fol. 261), and Conn to Barberini, July 31, 1637 (8641, fols. 37, 41); cf. Frascchetti, *Il Bernini* (Milan, 1900), p. 111, n. 1. We are indebted to Mr. Cust for the reproduction of the only engraving extant of the bust (*Notes*, p. 8).

<sup>52</sup> Conn to Barberini, Oct. 9, 1636. Barb. 8639, fol. 130. Cf. Apr. 24, 1637, Barb. 8640, fol. 248 seq.



given circumstances, the Church of Rome favored the doctrine of tyrannicide.<sup>53</sup> But, more or less, he used to associate these blemishes of Roman Catholicism with the Jesuits, who were in his mind on a level with the Puritans. Strange as it sounds, the king seldom mentioned the Puritans to Conn without calling them jesuitical, and seldom the Jesuits without describing them as the Puritans of Rome. The king hated both of them, hated the extremes which they represented, and he felt at the same time that extremes meet. He was too refined, too delicate, too aesthetic to endure the harshness which is inseparable from strong characters. His disgust at the Jesuits, and at the Puritans too, is quite as much due to moral as to political antagonism.

The main political result of the sympathy of Charles with Rome was, of course, the partial (not complete) suspension of the penal laws against the Roman Catholics during the time of his personal government. Though the king was obliged by his unfortunate marriage treaty to suspend the laws, he would hardly have done so, if it had not been repugnant to his mind to persecute men with whom he felt, to a certain degree, one in creed, whom, at least, he decidedly preferred to his Puritan subjects. All reasons of political expediency were against suspending the laws. If Charles by the suspension secured the good-will of France and the pope, he forfeited the confidence of his subjects. It is an acknowledged fact that his reluctance to put priests to death for their religion was one of the chief causes of the rupture between the crown and the Parliament. Count Rossetti, the papal agent, reports that soon after the dissolution of the Short Parliament Archbishop Laud on his knees implored Charles to enforce the penal laws against Catholics. But even after the full outbreak of the crisis, in the beginning of 1641, the king firmly declined to sacrifice the life of a priest, John Goodman, in order to win the good will of City and Parliament. "I do not sell men's lives", the king said. Rossetti writes in February, 1641: "The question whether Goodman shall live or die, has turned into the question whether the supreme authority lies with the king or the Parliament. There is no other topic of conversation at present."<sup>54</sup>

It would be a mistake to make the queen's influence with Charles responsible for his leniency towards the Catholics. In several instances her influence is visible, indeed, and is not very creditable to her judgment. But, as a whole, the direct influence of Henrietta Maria was not very great; she was not a politician. She exercised

<sup>53</sup> Conn to Barberini, May 8, 1637. Barb. 8640, fol. 288.

<sup>54</sup> Rossetti to Barberini, Feb. 8, 1641; cf. Gardiner, *History of England*, IX. 265.



however an indirect, unconscious influence which can hardly be overestimated. The personal attachment of Charles to his queen made it morally impossible for him to be harsh against her co-religionists. Especially at the time when she was about to become a mother (and that occurred six times during the period of the personal government of Charles), the king was anxious to avoid any sort of measure against Roman Catholics that was likely to cause her pain.

Had it not been for his lack of money, Charles would have willingly discharged the Catholics from their legal fines as well as from the danger to life and liberty. But he could not afford this, so he merely softened the burden of fines through selling letters patent which entitled the bearer to absent himself from the Anglican service. The annual return from these letters patent fell a good deal short of what Charles would have had, had he put the penal laws into force. The king, therefore, through favoring the Catholics, materially and morally weakened his sovereign power. When in the end he professed himself a martyr for his people, this has some justification in respect to at least one section of his people, his Roman Catholic subjects.

If we now ask the question, what Rome did, on the other hand, for Charles in return for all the favor shown to her children, the answer can only be: materially, nothing. Gifts out of her great treasury of art were the only acknowledgment. And, as a matter of fact, Rome could not do any more, as long as Charles did not become a convert. It is true there were the famous five millions of scudi in the Castle of S. Angelo, but according to the rules laid down by Pope Sixtus V., who had hoarded them, this treasure was not to be touched, except for averting the loss of a country from the Catholic Church, or for the re-conquest of the Holy Land, or some similar purpose. When, therefore, at the end of 1640, Queen Henrietta Maria sent a pathetic appeal for help to Cardinal Barberini,<sup>55</sup> his answer was bound to be: "Only in the case of the conversion of the king should I be in a position to ask His Holiness to unlock the treasure of S. Angelo."<sup>56</sup> The queen answered that the king would proclaim liberty of conscience if the pope helped to restore him; conversion at this moment would mean the loss of his crown. The cardinal replied coldly, that the king *had* lost his crown already (he wrote this in February, 1641), that liberty of conscience applied to all sects, while Rome wanted nothing except liberty for the

<sup>55</sup> She did so without any knowledge on the king's part: "Il n'i a personne que sa S.té vous et moy qui sache sesy encore". Barb. 8615, fols. 83-86.

<sup>56</sup> Barberini to Rossetti, Feb. 1, 1641. Barb. 8649, fol. 124; cf. Jan. 26, fol. 94.

Catholic religion, and this had been granted already by the marriage treaty.<sup>57</sup>

With the same definiteness with which Rome declared some years before that the articles of the Creed could not be matters of negotiation in bringing about the union, she now and hereafter professed herself unable to support the tottering throne of Charles, so long as one who was not an avowed Catholic was seated on it. Yet there can be no doubt that Charles never seriously contemplated becoming a convert or restoring the Church of Rome in any of his kingdoms. Even after the battle of Naseby had been fought, the king refused to secure the assistance of the Irish confederates by allowing them to have the existing churches, ready though he was to grant them freedom of worship in chapels which they built for themselves. For with him surrender of the churches would have meant abandonment of his religion and submission to rebellion. "I will rather chuse to suffer all extremitie than ever to abandon my religion, and particularly either to English or Irish rebels."<sup>58</sup> Pride, quite as much as religion, forbade him to yield, and the feeling, once strong within him, of an affinity in culture with Rome, was now of no consequence whatever. The great idea which he cherished during the days of his happiness was reunion with Rome, but on equal terms, not in the way of submission. That he ever thought this possible shows how much he misunderstood both the Church of Rome and his own country.

ARNOLD OSKAR MEYER.

<sup>57</sup> Feb. 9, 16, June 15, 1641. Barb. 8649, fols. 153 *seq.*, fol. 175; Barb. 8650, fols. 15-17.

<sup>58</sup> The king to the Marquis of Ormond, Cardiff, July 31, 1645. Thomas Carte, *The Life of James Duke of Ormond*, VI. 306 (Oxford, 1851).

## THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE CABINET, 1688-1760

### PART II

THE period of the first two Georges is beyond all others the era when cabinet government began in England. During those years the great lords and politicians, once servants and advisers, became advisers and masters of the crown. Steadily the king was deprived of authority until he himself confessed it and ceased to protest.<sup>1</sup> During those years power passed from the king and Privy Council alike to small groups of men, lords of the committee, lords of the cabinet council, lords justices, and smaller circles of powerful leaders, who silently and in private guided the destinies of the nation. By 1760 the process was complete for the time being. Neither king at Kensington nor Parliament at Westminster then ruled the nation, but a small group of important political leaders meeting apart at the call of their leaders.

In 1714 the executive both legally and actually was the king, though his power had been dwindling steadily since 1688. The prerogative of the sovereign was still very great, and even after this time royal authority declined less rapidly than has sometimes been supposed; nevertheless, prerogative was waning, and a transfer of power was taking place from the sovereign to the confidential advisers of the crown, the lords of the cabinet council. It is true that the body which assisted the king in the rule of the realm was supposed to be his Privy Council, but little authority remained to it except in formal and customary procedure, such as the issuing of writs for new elections, the proroguing of Parliament or convocation, the giving out of proclamations and orders of council, and the granting or denying of petitions and memorials, all of which was now usually done without protest or debate, as a result of decisions made previously and elsewhere.<sup>2</sup> The important work of the Privy Council was being done by the committee of council, a standing committee of the whole Privy Council. By 1714 cabinet and com-

<sup>1</sup> "Your Ministers, sir, are only your instruments of government.' This was too much for Royal patience. The King smiled and said bitterly, 'Ministers are the King in this country.'" Account by Lord Hardwicke of an interview with the king, January 5, 1745. Quoted in W. M. Torrens, *History of Cabinets, etc.*, II. 53.

<sup>2</sup> Southwell, *Privy Council Routine, 1692-1695*, Add. MSS., 34,349; *Privy Council Memoranda, 1660-1708*, Add. MSS., 35,107; St. P. Dom., Anne; Duc d'Aumont in Salomon, *Geschichte des letzten Ministeriums Königin Annas*, p. 352.

mittee had approximated to each other so closely that it might almost be said that the members of the committee, meeting in a royal cabinet or apartment to advise the sovereign, made up the cabinet council, while the same men, meeting in Whitehall to prepare and decide the business of the Privy Council, made up the committee of council. In 1714 the cabinet contained fifteen members;<sup>3</sup> apparently in a meeting of the committee there were about the same number.<sup>4</sup>

These two bodies, which were now taking over the executive and administrative work of the nation, though they might well seem to be modes of one and the same thing, were yet fundamentally different in origin and possible development. The committee was and continued to be the essence of the Privy Council, while the cabinet was a confidential and extra-legal council of the sovereign. Notwithstanding that the two had practically the same members, they began now to move along different lines of development. As the importance of the Privy Council continued to decline, the power of the committee dwindled; but as the greatness of the sovereign became less, his power was taken over by the cabinet, which became stronger and ever more important. After 1740, the committee may be the co-worker, but it can no longer be the rival of the cabinet.

In the growth of the cabinet during this period the same phenomenon is seen as earlier in the case of the Privy Council: membership increases until the body becomes unwieldy and relatively ineffective, and as a result its activity and real power are taken over by a small group, an inner circle, or part of the cabinet itself. In the period 1688-1714 the principal interest of the student must be in the double development of the cabinet and the committee of council; in the period 1714-1760 attention should be drawn to the development of the private meeting of ministers, and the gradual emergence of the inner cabinet or "conciliabulum".<sup>5</sup>

The study of this period presents a problem essentially different from that of the years preceding. The development of the cabinet from 1688 to 1714 is difficult to understand because of lack of material, the student having to rely for the most part upon allusion and chance information. His task, then, is to a great extent one of research. In the Hanoverian period, on the other hand, it is possible to accumulate great numbers of actual minutes, memoranda, notes, and records;<sup>6</sup> but these records are most often endorsed

<sup>3</sup> "List of the Cabinet Councill", St. P. Dom., George I., I. 261.

<sup>4</sup> Thirteen in 1718. St. P. Dom., Entry Books, CXIX., April 14, 1718.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. H. W. V. Temperley, "Inner and Outer Cabinet and Privy Council, 1679-1783", *English Historical Review*, XXVII. 682.

<sup>6</sup> For a discussion of the materials cf. my "Sources for the History of the English Cabinet in the Eighteenth Century", *Report of the Amer. Hist. Assoc.*,

simply with a date or with the caption "Minutes".<sup>7</sup> After some investigation, it becomes apparent that these papers, which in content may scarcely be distinguished one from the other, relate to a variety of meetings very different in character; and this diversity is established by the fact that the subsidiary material of the period contains allusions to cabinets, committees of council, private meetings, and inner councils,<sup>8</sup> and a few of the minutes themselves are specifically so endorsed. Accordingly, the problem here is one of interpretation and collation, after reading through bundles of faded and scribbled papers to gather details from the humdrum routine of official business. So elusive and difficult is the material that positive results can scarcely be obtained without a systematic comparison of the entire mass of minutes remaining among the papers of the secretaries of state, in the Public Record Office, with the great body of those to be found among the remains of such officials as Newcastle and Hardwicke, and then interpreting them all in the light of explanations occurring at random in contemporary correspondence and in the diaries of men who attended the meetings, like Lord Hervey and Sir John Norris.

At the beginning of the Hanoverian period the composition of the cabinet was substantially what it had been under William and under Anne. In 1701 Sunderland had advised Somers to admit none to the cabinet council but those "who have, in some sort, a right to enter there by their employment". He specified the Archbishop of Canterbury, the lord keeper, the lord president, the lord privy seal, the lord steward, the lord chamberlain, the first commissioner of the treasury, the two secretaries of state, and, when he happened to be at hand, the lord lieutenant of Ireland; that is to say, the great officials of the realm. He also suggested, though he did not advise, the addition of the first commissioner of the admiralty and the master of the ordnance.<sup>9</sup> In 1711 the cabinet contained eleven members.<sup>10</sup> In the year following, the Duc d'Aumont wrote an account of it. According to him it consisted of the Archbishop of Canterbury, the lord chancellor, the lord treasurer, the lord president,<sup>11</sup> the lord privy seal, the lord lieutenant of Ireland, the lord steward, the lord chamberlain, the master of the horse, and the two secretaries of state.<sup>12</sup> In the first year of the

<sup>7</sup> St. P. Dom., George I., George II., Various, *passim*; Newcastle Papers, Add. MSS., 32,993-33,004; Hardwicke Papers, Add. MSS., 35,870.

<sup>8</sup> For example, the Journals of Sir John Norris, Add. MSS., 28,132, 28,133.

<sup>9</sup> Hardwicke, *Miscellaneous State Papers*, II. 461.

<sup>10</sup> Edward Harley, jr., to Abigail Harley, March 22, 1710/1. Portland MSS., *Hist. MSS. Comm. Reports*, 15, IV. 669.

<sup>11</sup> Whom he calls "Président du Conseil du Cabinet".

<sup>12</sup> Salomon, *Geschichte des letzten Ministeriums*, pp. 352-356.

reign of George I., the addition of several influential leaders brought the number up to fifteen, including now, as of course, the great officials of the realm and the two secretaries.<sup>13</sup> The increasing importance of national finance also brings the chancellor of the exchequer definitely into the small council, and his name appears along with twelve others in a formal "List of the Cabinet Council" in 1717.<sup>14</sup> In 1729, a summons for a meeting has an endorsement which shows that the cabinet at that time contained fourteen members, including in addition to a number of prominent Whig leaders, such dignitaries as the archbishop, the lord chancellor, the lord privy seal, the lord steward, the lord chamberlain, the chancellor of the exchequer, and the secretaries of state.<sup>15</sup> In 1738 there were fourteen or more members.<sup>16</sup> The same was true in 1740;<sup>17</sup> while in the year following there were at least fifteen.<sup>18</sup> The number tended to increase slowly. In 1744 it was seventeen or more.<sup>19</sup> In 1757, Newcastle notes that the "Cabinet Council at present" includes sixteen members, while he was at the moment planning to add three more. The entire list included practically all the important officials of the realm: the Archbishop of Canterbury, the lord chancellor, the lord president, the lord privy seal, the lord steward, the lord chamberlain, the chancellor of the exchequer, three secretaries of state—for Newcastle proposed to add the secretary of state to the Indies—the lord lieutenant of Ireland, the lord chief justice, the first commissioner of the treasury, the first commissioner of the admiralty, the chancellor of Scotland, the master of the ordnance, the master of the horse, and the groom of the stole.<sup>20</sup>

Nor did these large numbers indicate merely nominal membership. Not infrequently the entire body attended for the consideration of some important business. In 1735 eleven members considered the petition of the South Sea Company,<sup>21</sup> while a little later fourteen deliberated upon communications relating to a dispute with Spain.<sup>22</sup> In 1737 the same number assembled to consider what action should be taken with reference to a recent reception of the Pretender's son at Venice.<sup>23</sup> In 1738 such a cabinet decided to give

<sup>13</sup> St. P. Dom., George I., I. 261.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid.*, IX., May, 1717.

<sup>15</sup> St. P. Dom., Various, I., June 9, 1729.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, II., February 15, March 14, 1737/8.

<sup>17</sup> Add. MSS., 33,004, ff. 41-43.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, ff. 46, 47; St. P. Dom., Various, III., January 16, 1740/1.

<sup>19</sup> Add. MSS., 33,004, ff. 58, 59; St. P. Dom., Various, V., February 2, 1743/4.

<sup>20</sup> Newcastle Papers, Add. MSS., 32,997, f. 146. Sir Thomas Robinson is mentioned as "Additional".

<sup>21</sup> St. P. Dom., Various, I., March 12, 1734/5.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, April 14, 1735.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, II., June 16, 1737.

notice that the king would grant letters of reprisal against Spain.<sup>24</sup> A meeting of fifteen approved a draft of the king's message to the House of Lords in 1739,<sup>25</sup> and a month later advised the king to begin war against Spain.<sup>26</sup> In 1741, when the news reached England that Frederick of Prussia had seized Silesia, a cabinet of fifteen debated the grave question, whether England should fulfil her treaty engagements in support of the Pragmatic Sanction.<sup>27</sup> In 1744, seventeen members met to decide what orders were made necessary by the sailing of the French squadron from Brest.<sup>28</sup> A few days later fourteen considered the advisability of suspending the habeas corpus act;<sup>29</sup> and at this time meetings of fourteen, fifteen, and sixteen were held repeatedly.<sup>30</sup> During the crisis of 1745, a meeting of fourteen considered how London might best be defended.<sup>31</sup> Except for very important matters the number now showed a tendency to decline, but meetings of ten, twelve, and thirteen were not unusual.<sup>32</sup>

The increase was owing to the fact that from time to time cabinet leaders found it necessary to admit influential associates in order to gain their support.<sup>33</sup> As early as 1694 William experienced difficulty in restricting the number in his cabinet.<sup>34</sup> In 1720, Lady Cowper spoke of the body as a mob.<sup>35</sup> But during these years, while the cabinet was slowly increasing in numbers, it was also increasing its activity and power, with the result that the leaders were presently compelled to recognize that it was becoming too big to be effective, and too unwieldy for frequent assembly and decisive action. Therefore it was inevitable as time went on that the enlarging cabinet should undergo a change similar to that which had char-

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, February 15, 1737/8.

<sup>25</sup> *Ibid.*, May 7, 1739.

<sup>26</sup> *Ibid.*, June 3, 1739.

<sup>27</sup> *Ibid.*, III., January 16, 1740/1; Add. MSS., 28,133, ff. 74, 75; 33,004, ff. 46, 47.

<sup>28</sup> St. P. Dom., Various, V., February 2, 1743/4.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, February 16, 1743/4.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, February 23, 24, 26, 27, 28, March 2, 5, 1743/4.

<sup>31</sup> *Ibid.*, December 6, 1745.

<sup>32</sup> *Ibid.*, George II., LXXXVI., August 6, 15, 1746; XC., December 15, 1746; XCV., March 26, 1747; XCVII., May 25, 1747; Add. MSS., 35,870, ff. 222, 223 (1751), 226-229 (1753); King's MSS., LXXV., June 29, 1755; Add. MSS., 32,997, f. 207 (1757); 32,998, ff. 382, 383 (1760).

<sup>33</sup> It is probable that Walpole tolerated Newcastle in the latter years of their association because the seats in the Commons controlled by the duke were necessary for the maintenance of his power.

<sup>34</sup> Coxe, *Correspondence of Shrewsbury*, pp. 38, 39.

<sup>35</sup> Describing a reception at St. James's, she says: "Because the Chancellor was not to *s'encanailler*, he came alone, and a very little While after, the Mob of the Cabinet, with little Kent at their Head." *Diary*, April 27, 1720.



acterized the enlarging Privy Council, namely, that its power should be to a considerable extent taken over by a smaller part of itself.

When this began and exactly what were the specific causes of the change it is not possible to discover now. As a rule, no doubt, the entire membership of the cabinet council was not present at a cabinet meeting, simply because it was inconvenient for all the members to attend. In 1729 and 1730, the cabinet contained at least fourteen persons, but it was seldom that more than half that number assembled.<sup>36</sup> On July 26, 1730, a cabinet of seven at Windsor considered French and Spanish matters.<sup>37</sup> On May 25, 1731, a cabinet of five deliberated whether reprisals should be made upon Spanish commerce in the West Indies.<sup>38</sup> A list of cabinet members in 1729, endorsed "Summons for a Cabinet", contains a note stating that "Bowys has summoned all that are in town". The meeting which followed was attended, probably, by nine.<sup>39</sup> As might be expected, it is the active and important members who are generally present, those merely with great names inherited from the past who stay away. In 1730, the Archbishop of Canterbury, the lord steward, and the lord chamberlain rarely come to the cabinet; Walpole and the secretaries of state are seldom away. They come, doubtless, because they desire to come, and because their presence is necessary for the conduct of business. The great officers of the king's household may attend, and do attend sometimes,<sup>40</sup> but they doubtless discover after a while that their presence is not indispensable, and that they are not able to take an active or influential part as regards matters in which they are not closely engaged. It can only be surmised that this is true, but it is very probable that it is so. Nevertheless, the fact is evident, that of the entire membership of the cabinet council only a part attends, unless the business to be considered is of great solemnity or importance, like drafting the king's speech or advising a declaration of war,<sup>41</sup> and that certain members are usually not present.

This development, as a result of which a part of the cabinet

<sup>36</sup> St. P. Dom., Various, I., June 9, 11, 1729; September 21, 1730; St. P. Dom., George II., XII., June 17, 1729.

<sup>37</sup> St. P. Dom., Various, I., July 26, 1730.

<sup>38</sup> *Ibid.*, May 25, 1731.

<sup>39</sup> *Ibid.*, June 9, 11, 1729.

<sup>40</sup> For example: the lord privy seal attended July 17 and 26, 1730, and June 30, 1731; the lord president, May 25, June 11, 28, and 30, 1731; the lord chamberlain, June 30, 1731. September 28, 1732, the lord chancellor, the lord president, the lord privy seal, and the lord chamberlain were all present, as they were also October 10. St. P. Dom., Various, I.

<sup>41</sup> Cf. St. P. Dom., Various, I., January 11, 1731/2; V., March 29, 1744; Add. MSS., 33,004, ff. 46, 47.



council tends to become the real and effective cabinet, is facilitated by the device of private meetings of the cabinet members, to which, in course of time, only the most important members are admitted. The private meeting develops when the cabinet meets without the king, in such place and such manner as it pleases.

The cabinet, which was in its origin the private council of the sovereign, met, during the earlier period, only in the royal presence. This was always so under William, and I know of but one doubtful exception under Anne. Such also was the rule when George I. came to the throne. For a while the king continued to attend,<sup>42</sup> and when he could not be present, meetings seem to have been postponed.<sup>43</sup> Even while he was absent in Hanover, in 1716, his place in the cabinet meeting was taken by the Prince of Wales.<sup>44</sup> Notwithstanding, George labored under such great disadvantages that his attendance as well as his leadership in the cabinet soon came to an end. He knew little of the laws or the constitution of the kingdom which he had come to govern, and not knowing the language of his new subjects, could with difficulty converse with his ministers in bad Latin. This in itself placed him entirely at the mercy of his chief officials;<sup>45</sup> but the circumstances of his accession made the very maintenance of his throne dependent upon their support. Accordingly he was neither able to oppose them nor to dispense with their services in the conduct of English affairs;<sup>46</sup> but he was furthermore unable to participate in the conduct of these affairs himself. The result was that the king soon came to the cabinet very infre-

<sup>42</sup> St. P. Dom., George I., VIII., January 29, 1717; IX., June 19, 1717, and *passim*. Also, "There is a Cabinet Council summoned to attend his Majesty at St. James's to Morrow at twelve." George Tilson to Sir Henry Penrice. St. P. Dom., Entry Books, CXXII., July 13, 1721.

<sup>43</sup> "I forgot to ask My Lord whether a Cabinet Council should be summoned for Thursday next and whether for the Morning or Evening in regard to His Maty's drinking the Waters." Delasaye to Tilson. St. P. Dom., George I., IX., August 13, 1717. "I this moment receive yours of the 13th; my Lord says there must be no Cabinet Council, the King continuing to take the Waters." Tilson to Delasaye. *Ibid*.

<sup>44</sup> St. P. Dom., Entry Books, CCLXVII., July 13, August 14, 25, October 4, 11, 12, November 15, 16, 1716.

<sup>45</sup> "Cette ignorance de la langue et des affaires . . . n'a pas permis au Roi d'abolir un Conseil que l'ignorance des affaires dans le chef a introduit sous le règne précédent . . . Cette nécessité où S. M. est de continuer ce Conseil le prive d'une infinité de lumières, ne lui fait voir que l'écorce de plusieurs affaires et confère un grand pouvoir à ses ministres." Bonet in Michael, *Englische Geschichte im achtzehnten Jahrhundert*, I. 440, note.

<sup>46</sup> "She [the Princess of Wales] said [to the king], 'Sir, I tell you they say the Ministry does Everything, and you Nothing.' He smiled, and said, 'This is all the Thanks I get for all the Pains I take.'" *Diary of Lady Cowper*, February 20, 1716.

quently, though occasional instances can be found as late as 1781.<sup>47</sup>

The withdrawal of the king from the meetings of the cabinet made it no longer necessary to hold the meetings in the royal palace, as had been the case previously. For a long time cabinets did assemble at the king's residence, when it was desirable to communicate with him readily;<sup>48</sup> but after 1720 the vast majority of the meetings were held elsewhere. At first nearly all the gatherings of ministers took place in the office of the secretary of state, in the Cockpit, at Whitehall.<sup>49</sup> Later on they were held wherever the cabinet leaders desired. During the reign of George I., while the meetings were called largely in Whitehall, it is very difficult to distinguish them from meetings of the committee of council, held in the same place;<sup>50</sup> which gives no little speciousness to the theory, sometimes maintained, that the cabinet of the Georges is descended from the committee of council of the period of Anne.<sup>51</sup> It may be that for a while cabinet ministers meeting apart from the king transacted business of state in committees of council at Whitehall as, indeed, they had long been wont to do; and that real cabinet meetings were held only at rare intervals at Kensington or at St. James's. In the absence of specific information, the point is a difficult one to decide; but it is probable that as early as 1719 cabinet meetings, without the king, were held in the Cockpit.<sup>52</sup> There is no doubt,

<sup>47</sup> Cf. Temperley, *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, XXVII. 693; C. G. Robertson, *England under the Hanoverians*, pp. 508, 509. The most important instance, probably, is a meeting held at St. James's at the most critical moment of the Rebellion of 1745. Fourteen members assembled to confer with the king. Most of them were present at two other cabinets held at Whitehall the same day. St. P. Dom., Various, V., December 6, 1745. Sir John Norris notes in his Journal, November 14, 1739, "This noon his Majesty had a Cabinet Counsell at St. Jamesis upon his Speech." Add. MSS., 28,132, f. 78.

<sup>48</sup> For example: Hampton Court: St. P. Dom., George I., IX., August 8, 1717. Windsor: St. P. Dom., Various, I., July 9, 12, 17, 26, September 21, 1730. Hampton Court: *ibid.*, June 11, 25, 28, 1731; II., September 9, October 11, 1737. Kensington: *ibid.*, I., September 28, 1732; V., September 20, 24, 1745. St. James's: *ibid.*, V., December 6, 1745.

<sup>49</sup> St. P. Dom., George I., George II., Various, *passim*.

<sup>50</sup> See *ante*, pp. 762-768, of the preceding volume of this journal.

<sup>51</sup> "Das Kabinett König Georgs recht eigentlich die Fortsetzung des 'Committee' und nicht des 'Cabinet Council' Königin Annas ist." Salomon, *Geschichte des letzten Ministeriums*, p. 356, note.

<sup>52</sup> In 1719 a meeting of ten men, all of whom seem to have been members of the cabinet, deliberated about transporting troops to England, and causing the Admiralty to fit out more ships. The record is endorsed "Committee of Council, at the Cockpit". St. P. Dom., George I., XV., March 13, 1718/9. On the same day a meeting of nine was held in the Cockpit. Every name in the list occurs in the list of those present at the meeting of the committee. "The Lords" were of opinion that a proclamation should be issued against persons attainted in the late rebellion, and that rewards should be offered for apprehending them. *Ibid.* These would appear to be two different bodies, though it is possible that we have two sets of minutes of the same meeting.

however, that this gradually came to be the custom.<sup>53</sup> When, in 1739, Sir John Norris was invited to attend meetings of the chief ministers, he records in his diary again and again that he was present at cabinets in the office of the secretary of state in Whitehall,<sup>54</sup> and it would appear from his expressions that cabinets were at that time rarely held in other places.<sup>55</sup>

From assembling in Whitehall to transact cabinet business it was but a single step for members to meet wherever they chose. Accordingly, they are found discussing policy and considering measures in the private houses of some of their number, the most usual place being in the house of the prime minister. At first such meetings were undoubtedly not considered cabinet meetings, but were looked upon merely as private meetings of the ministers who attended.

Private meetings of the king's ministers probably originated in the desire to prepare business for cabinet or council meetings, in order that it might be more expeditiously dealt with when it came up for consideration. It would seem that the ministers of Charles II. did this with some regularity as early as 1680.<sup>56</sup> In 1683 the secretary of state sent out a communication to the effect that "My Ld Keeper and severall other Lds of the Councill having appointed a meeting to be att my hous in old Spring Garden, between 7 and eight of the clock this present Tuesday in the afternoon, you are desired to be there attending at that time."<sup>57</sup> It is probable that a great deal of business was thus settled in a preliminary way. Not only was this quite natural, but, as the cabinet leaders became more and more powerful, and so, less willing to brook interference, it must have seemed both necessary and desirable that they should do much business in this fashion. Particularly when the king ceased attending the cabinet, and when cabinet meetings began to be held at

<sup>53</sup> John Couraud, writing to Newcastle in 1735, says that the answer to be returned to Sir Thomas Fitzgerald is to be settled at a meeting of the "Cabinet Council, which is summoned for Monday next at Your Grace's Office". St. P. Dom., George II., XXXVII., December 13, 1735. In the year following, Lord Harrington summons Sir David Patten in these words: "I am to desire that you will please to attend the Lords of his Majesty's Cabinet Council this Evening at seven o'clock at the Duke of Newcastle's Office in the Cockpit Whitehall, their Lordships meeting there at that hour." St. P. Dom., Entry Books, CXXIX., September 17, 1736.

<sup>54</sup> Sir John Norris, Journals, Add. MSS., 28,132, ff. 34, 51, 71 (1739), 119, 136, 151, 160, 163, 164, 165, 166, 169, 174, 183, 193 (1740); 28,133, ff. 64, 67, 68 (1740), 74 (1741).

<sup>55</sup> He records a meeting at St. James's, November 14, 1739. Add. MSS., 28,132, f. 78.

<sup>56</sup> Lord Keeper Guilford, "Memoranda Historica", Add. MSS., 32,520, f. 253. Cf. North, *Lives of the Norths*, II. 62, 63.

<sup>57</sup> St. P. Dom., Entry Books, LXVIII., April 24, 1683.

Whitehall away from the king, it must have been easy for ministers to meet whenever and in such places as they chose. It may be that as much effective work could be done at Sir Robert Walpole's house in Chelsea, or at Newcastle's residence in Lincoln's Inn Fields, as in the secretary's office in the Cockpit, and with more intimacy and good cheer for those who assembled. However this be, at the beginning of the Hanoverian period private meetings of the important ministers have come to be usual, and in these meetings business of importance is discussed and decided. In 1719, when the fate of the peerage bill was hanging in the balance, the leaders finally decided that the measure should go to the Commons after they had deliberated in such a gathering.<sup>58</sup> On this occasion, Craggs supported the bill in the House of Commons, though, according to a contemporary, he opposed it "in the private consultations of the Ministers upon it".<sup>59</sup> Frequently, no doubt, these meetings were so small and informal as to be unimportant,<sup>60</sup> but the tendency was increasingly to make of them small cabinet meetings of the most influential members of the cabinet council. In 1722, the lord chancellor, the lord president, the lord chamberlain, the Duke of Devonshire, Townshend, Walpole, and Carteret assembled at the Duke of Devonshire's house, and resolved upon measures to guard against a possible French invasion.<sup>61</sup> This was not a meeting of the cabinet, but it was a gathering of the most important and skilful members working in the manner which suited them best. By 1730 these meetings are being held, perhaps, as frequently as formal meetings of the cabinet, and a great deal of important policy and business of government is both considered and decided there.<sup>62</sup> This was true to a greater extent ten years later, when Sir John Norris attended.<sup>63</sup> After 1730 the number of private meetings is

<sup>58</sup> "I am informed . . . that at a private meeting of the Chief Ministers last night it was resolved to send it down to us to take its fate." Marquess of Granby to the Duke of Rutland. Rutland MSS., *Hist. MSS. Comm. Reports*, 12, V. 193.

<sup>59</sup> Onslow MSS., *Hist. MSS. Comm. Reports*, 14, IX. 459.

<sup>60</sup> For example: "I desire that you will be pleased to meet my Lord Townshend and me to morrow morning at Eleven o'clock at the Earl of Sunderland's house." Carteret to Sir John Eyles. St P. Dom., Entry Books, CXXI., November 30, 1721.

<sup>61</sup> St. P. Dom., George I., XXXI., April 23, 1722.

<sup>62</sup> St. P. Dom., Various, I., 1730.

<sup>63</sup> Journals, Add. MSS., 28,132, ff. 14, 63, 70, 80, 86, 87, 94, 95, 97, 99, 106, 109, 111 (1739), 114, 117, 120, 131, 141, 145, 147, 155, 166, 168, 190 (1740); *ibid.*, 28,133, ff. 6, 12, 14, 58, 61, 63, 67, 75, 77 (1740). Cf. also St. P. Dom., Various, II., August 13, 1739, January 11, 21, 28, February 4, 13, March 5, 1739/40, April 1, May 20, 1740; St. P. Dom., George II., LI., June 16, 19, July 2, 3, 1740; LII., September 8, 18, 1740; LIII., October 9, 14, November 20, 25, 27, 1740; LIV., December 2, 12, 1740.

probably as great as the number of meetings of the cabinet wherever held.

The relation between the private meeting and the formal meeting of the cabinet was, roughly, that in the smaller meetings of ministers preliminary consideration was given to business which later on would be decided upon in a gathering of the members of the cabinet, whose consent was necessary before the final decision could be taken. On October 29, 1739, Sir John Norris writes: "This Evening I was at a private meeting at Sr Robt Walpole house, the company being his selfe and Brother Horry the Duke of Newcastle and his Brother Henry Pelham the Duke of Grafton, Lord Harrington, Sr Charles Wager and my selfe." Here there was a long discussion about the best means of making an attack upon the possessions of Spain.<sup>64</sup> Two days later he records: "At 7 this Evening was a Counsell of the Cabinet at the Duke of Newcastle office, present his Grace and the Duke of Grafton and Dorsett Lord Pembroke and Ila, the Lord Chancellor Sr Robert Walpole Sr Charles wager and my selfe."<sup>65</sup> The next day there was a similar gathering at Whitehall, at which were present the lord chancellor, the lord steward, the lord chamberlain, the earls of Pembroke and Ilay, Lord Harrington, Sir Robert Walpole, Sir Charles Wager, Sir John Norris, and the Duke of Newcastle. Here there was further consideration of Spanish matters, and it was decided what disposition should be made of certain booty, and what instructions should be sent to Haddock and Vernon with reference to the sailing of the *Flota* from Cadiz.<sup>66</sup> On May 22, 1740, the lord chancellor, the lord president, Sir Robert Walpole, Sir John Norris, and the Duke of Newcastle assembled at Sir Robert's house,<sup>67</sup> where they considered numerous details relating to naval matters, and agreed to summon the cabinet council.<sup>68</sup> Two days later there was a meeting of all the cabinet members at Whitehall.<sup>69</sup> Those who came were the lord chancellor, the lord president, the lord privy seal, the lord steward, the lord chamberlain, the dukes of Richmond, Bolton, Devonshire, and Montagu, the earls of Pembroke and Ilay, Sir Robert Walpole, Sir John Norris, and the Duke of Newcastle. The matters which had been discussed at Sir Robert's house were brought forward, given further consideration, and finally decided.<sup>70</sup>

<sup>64</sup> Add. MSS., 28,132, ff. 63-70.

<sup>65</sup> *Ibid.*, f. 71.

<sup>66</sup> St. P. Dom., Various, II., November 1, 1739.

<sup>67</sup> Add. MSS., 28,132, f. 190.

<sup>68</sup> St. P. Dom., Various, II., May 20, 1740.

<sup>69</sup> "This Evening I was at the Duke of Newcastle office whare all the Cabinnett Counsell was present." Sir John Norris, Journals, Add. MSS., 28,132, f. 193.

<sup>70</sup> St. P. Dom., Various, II., May 22, 1740.

Private meetings were held at the houses of the cabinet leaders, usually at the residence of the prime minister. During the days of Walpole's supremacy, most of the gatherings were at his house; after 1742, most of them were at the Duke of Newcastle's or at the lord chancellor's, and occasionally elsewhere.<sup>71</sup> They took place for the most part in the evening. The attendance ranged from four or five to eight or ten, and sometimes more. Those usually present were the prime minister, the secretaries of state, and some of the cabinet members conspicuous because of ability,<sup>72</sup> or necessary because of political power. Outsiders, who had no cabinet position, were often called in, when their presence was desirable because of the nature of the business to be transacted, as Horatio Walpole, brother of Sir Robert and ambassador at the court of France, when diplomatic matters came before the meeting, or Admiral Sir John Norris, when naval affairs were under discussion. Meetings were held by agreement,<sup>73</sup> or as a result of messages or summons to individuals from Walpole or Newcastle.<sup>74</sup> There was apparently no set time. Frequently they took place every day or so;<sup>75</sup> sometimes long intervals elapsed between.

The business considered was, generally speaking, cabinet business of every kind, all sorts of foreign and domestic affairs coming up for discussion. At these meetings were taken up such matters as the political situation on the Continent and the proper policy of England as a consequence; the relations of England with France, Spain, Portugal, and the Empire; the representations of foreign ministers; the assisting of allies; the preparing of hostile measures against the king's enemies; the victualling, disposition, and despatching of troops; preparing ships, and ordering the admirals to attack, seize, burn, and destroy; encouraging colonial governors to give assistance against France and Spain; the consideration of colonial defense; the fostering of trade and commerce; preserving order at home, and suppressing mutinies and riots; considering the desires of the king and preparing answers to his representations; preparing the first form of the king's speeches; and deliberating about the proper management of Parliament.

<sup>71</sup> St. P. Dom., George I., George II., Various, *passim*.

<sup>72</sup> Such, for example, was Lord Chancellor Hardwicke.

<sup>73</sup> Add. MSS., 32,687, f. 155.

<sup>74</sup> "On Saturday night the 19th of Febr: I was called to a Meeting at Sir Robt. Walpole's." Hardwicke Papers, Add. MSS., 35,870, f. 19 (1737). "I had a letter from Mr Stone the Duke of Newcastle Secretary signifying I would mete his Grace at Sr Robert Walpoles at seven this Evening, which I did." Sir John Norris, Journals, Add. MSS., 28,132, f. 80 (1739).

<sup>75</sup> For example: *ibid.*, ff. 86 (December 5, 1739), 95 (December 11), 97 (December 14), 99 (December 17); St. P. Dom., George II., LIII., November 20, 25, 27, 1740.



At these meetings the cabinet leaders talked over and frequently settled such matters as how to mediate between Spain and Portugal, and how to bring about an understanding between Austria and Spain; the payment of a subsidy to the Queen of Hungary, and how to persuade her to yield to the inevitable without driving her into the arms of France; the effecting an accommodation between the king and the Prince of Wales; the exact terms of the instructions to the lords justices; the draft of a bill for Parliament; the report of the Spanish ambassador as to what his master would do to satisfy the complaints of the English court; the affairs of the South Sea Company; that Vice-Admiral Vernon should be ordered to do all possible damage to the Spaniards; detailed naval instructions for Sir John Norris; how many troops the plantations could raise to serve in the West Indies and how many they probably would raise; secret instructions to the colonial governors; a report of the Admiralty, and directions to the Admiralty about the sending of provisions to Jamaica; how to convict certain rioters in Edinburgh.

Minutes of these meetings were regularly taken, as they were also of cabinet meetings.<sup>76</sup> In neither case were they copied into a register, as was done with the records of the Privy Council. They seem to have been made solely for the temporary use of those who attended, and for the king, or for important ministers who were compelled to be absent. Sometimes several copies of the same minutes can be found.<sup>77</sup>

During this period it is probable that cabinet meetings were held as often as private meetings of the ministers. There seems to have been no exact regularity, but cabinets were summoned as the leaders desired, this being determined sometimes in cabinet and sometimes in private meetings.<sup>78</sup> On some occasions the smaller meeting comes before the larger one; again the private meetings are held almost to the exclusion of cabinets; at other times ministers seem to do their business altogether in meetings of the cabinet council. So far as there is any regularity, cabinet meetings appear to be held at intervals of one or two weeks;<sup>79</sup> but in times of stress or danger they occur every day, and sometimes twice a day.<sup>80</sup> The time of

<sup>76</sup> The State Papers Domestic, Various, are made up almost entirely of these minutes.

<sup>77</sup> Many of the duplicates are to be found in the Newcastle MSS. and in the Hardwicke Papers.

<sup>78</sup> St. P. Dom., Various, III., January 27, April 15, 1741.

<sup>79</sup> For example: Add. MSS., 28,132, ff. 169, 174, 180, 183, 193; St. P. Dom., Various, II., April 23, 28, 30, May 5, 6, 22, 1740.

<sup>80</sup> "I am very much ashamed, That I have not sooner return'd Your Lordp. my Thanks for the Honor of Your two Letters. . . . But I am persuaded Your Lordp. will have the Goodness to attribute it to the very great Hurry of Business



assembling is either arranged from one meeting to another,<sup>81</sup> or made known by summons issued from the office of the secretary of state.<sup>82</sup> Cabinets were usually held in the secretary's office in the Cockpit in Whitehall, for the most part in the evening.<sup>83</sup>

The attendance varied from five or six up to fourteen or fifteen, the usual number being ten or twelve. For the most part the cabinet was larger than the private meeting of the ministers, though occasionally this was not so.<sup>84</sup> Those who attended were the cabinet members who generally took part in the private meetings, that is, the prime minister, the secretaries of state, and the most important of the political leaders, and, in addition, cabinet members who were usually not to be found at the smaller gatherings, such as the archbishop, the great officers of the king's household, and the less important leaders. Apparently the great dignitaries could always attend, but since they were taking less and less part in the conduct of the important affairs of state, they often stayed away from the formal meetings of the cabinet for the same reason that they were not invited to the private gatherings.

So far as the procedure can be ascertained from the minutes, it would seem that the proceedings tended to become more and more perfunctory, having to do largely with the hearing, consideration, and approval of what had previously been worked out in the smaller meetings. Divisions were infrequent.<sup>85</sup> Except on very important occasions there was not much effective debate, and apparently not much real discussion, these things taking place for the most part in

I have been in, for some time past; (The Cabinet-Council meeting almost every Night, and some times twice in a Day . . .") Newcastle to Earl Poulet. St. P. Dom., George II., LXXVII., December 13, 1745. Cf. St. P. Dom., Various, V., September 20, 24 (twice), 26, 30, October 1, 4, 10, 15, November 14, 25, 27, 29, December 5, 6 (three times), 7, 8, 10, 11, 12 (twice), 14, 28, 1745.

81 "Before we parted it was agreed that a Meeting of the whole Cabinet Council should be held on Friday the 9th of Sept. at 10 o'clock in the evening, to consider of this weighty affair, and the Lords summoned the next morning . . . to the end they might not want sufficient notice." Hardwicke's account, Add. MSS., 35,870, f. 26.

82 "The Lords of the Cabinet Council being to meet, at My Lord Duke of Newcastle's Office, in the Cockpit, tomorrow, at Eleven o'Clock, in the Forenoon. I am order'd by His Grace, to desire, that You would be pleased to meet their Lordships there, at that Hour." Andrew Stone to Sir John Norris. Add. MSS., 28,132, f. 33.

83 St. P. Dom., *passim*.

84 There was a meeting of ten at Sir Robert Walpole's, August 25, 1735, and one of eight on September 15. Meanwhile there were two cabinets at Whitehall of eight and seven respectively. St. P. Dom., Various, I., August 25, September 2, 4, 15, 1735. For a meeting of thirteen at Newcastle House, cf. *ibid.*, V., February 5, 1746/7.

85 For an instance, cf. St. P. Dom., Various, IV., November 24, 1743.

the private meetings.<sup>86</sup> It is not clear that the prime minister presided, or exercised any formal or unquestioned authority. Such a man as Walpole or Pitt could, indeed, make his authority felt and obeyed, but this leadership was rather the personal leadership of Walpole or Pitt than the official authority of a premier. Frequently he controlled his associates with difficulty, and sometimes not at all.<sup>87</sup> During the entire period the leadership of the cabinet may be said to be in the hands of the two or three most important and influential members, such as Stanhope and Sunderland, Walpole and Newcastle, Newcastle and Hardwicke and Pelham, Newcastle and Pitt, rather than in the hands of the prime minister alone. The proceedings and decisions were written down as "minutes", to be read, sometimes, at the beginning of the next meeting.<sup>88</sup> A foul copy was made usually by one of the secretaries of state, or by one of the under-secretaries, from rough memoranda furnished by his master. A fair or often an amended copy was sent to the king, while other copies were made for the principal members, and sometimes, apparently, by the members themselves.<sup>89</sup>

In the cabinet were considered all sorts of matters, foreign, domestic, colonial, parliamentary, and diplomatic. At these meetings the final draft of the king's speech was decided upon. Approval was given to answers to foreign ministers, or to English ministers abroad. Questions of policy and diplomacy were settled. Treaties were arranged. All sorts of military and naval business were despatched. Communications from the colonies were received and answered. Petitions were read and complaints considered. Measures were taken to maintain security and preserve the peace. The desires and commands of the king were considered, answers were returned to him through the prime minister, and advice was given him as to what he should do.

As examples of business before the cabinet may be cited: the supporting of the Pragmatic Sanction; crushing the Pretender in 1745; continuing a treaty with Hesse Cassel; replying to M. de Broglie's memorial; adjusting a dispute between Spain and Portugal; the consideration of military works erected by the Spaniards near Gibraltar; the ordering of reprisals upon Spanish commerce; the draft of a declaration of war; conferring with the lords com-

<sup>86</sup> In 1743, the question of giving assistance to Maria Theresa was thoroughly debated. Add MSS., 35,870, ff. 59-62. Cf. *ibid.*, f. 85.

<sup>87</sup> Cf. Hardwicke Papers, Add. MSS., 35,407, ff. 44, 53; Lord Hervey, *Memoirs of the Reign of George the Second*, etc. (Philadelphia, 1848), II. 414, 415.

<sup>88</sup> St. P. Dom., Various, II., September 25, 1739; V., March 28, 1744.

<sup>89</sup> St. P. Dom., Various, *passim*, and the papers of Newcastle and Hardwicke.

missioners of the admiralty; preparing drafts of instructions for the admirals; advising with the Board of Trade about the protection of Nova Scotia; hearing a memorial about Dutch ships detained by the embargo in Ireland; reading the petition of the South Sea Company in regard to the Asiento trade; measures for putting into effect a law to encourage trade in the West Indies; instructions for the postmaster-general; suppressing seditious matter written and printed; and the framing of a message from the king to the Prince of Wales.

It may be seen that the business transacted in the formal meetings of the cabinet was largely the same as that brought up in private meetings. The difference, so far as it existed, was that at first the consideration in the smaller groups was rather of a preliminary character. At Sir Robert Walpole's house business was considered and arranged so that with order and precision it might be considered and decided in Whitehall or at Kensington. But gradually an important development can be traced out. At first the private meeting merely prepares and the cabinet decides. In the smaller meeting is done the less important work; in the larger, the more important. Then, after a while, the smaller group becomes so powerful that what it prepares is decided in the larger group largely as it intends. There is now little difference between what is done in the private meeting and what is carried on in the cabinet council. Finally, the small group overshadows the large one, and at Newcastle House or at the lord chancellor's are decided important questions of politics or diplomacy which are brought to the cabinet merely for formal acquiescence, or are not reported at all.<sup>90</sup> It may be remarked that the relations between the private meetings of the principal ministers and the cabinet councils are entirely similar to those existing between the private meetings and the meetings of the lords justices, who ruled as regents while the sovereign was out of the realm.

After 1745 it becomes very difficult to distinguish a private meeting from a meeting of the cabinet, and so entirely has one absorbed the power of the other, that it is probable that the meetings which were now held in the houses of the chief ministers were really small cabinet meetings.<sup>91</sup> In 1757 the Duke of Newcastle speaks of the smaller group as the "conciliabulum",<sup>92</sup> and about the same time he alludes to the "Committee of the Cabinet Council".<sup>93</sup> There

<sup>90</sup> St. P. Dom., Various, IV., November 10, 1743.

<sup>91</sup> As late as 1755, however, Newcastle speaks of "the Private Meetings of the King's Servants". Add. MSS., 32,996, f. 227.

<sup>92</sup> *Ibid.*, 35,416, f. 181.

<sup>93</sup> *Ibid.*, 32,997, f. 207.

was, then, by this time, some recognition of that which had long existed, a double cabinet system. There were now, as has been well said, an inner and an outer cabinet.<sup>94</sup> There was a body of sixteen or more, consulted in supreme crises for advice and assistance, but otherwise only for formal approbation. Beside it was a group of four or six or ten, as suited the leaders, which did the planning and the considering and the deciding, and was the real cabinet and the real governing body of the kingdom.

It has been my purpose to trace in some detail the manner in which the Privy Council, as it enlarged, gave over its initiative and power to the committee of council and the cabinet; also the manner in which the cabinet became the principal heir to this authority; and then, how in process of time the cabinet, enlarging, lost the greater part of its real importance to the private meeting or conciliabulum or inner cabinet, which had been brought forth from itself. Such a record is apt to be as cold and lifeless and dull as the crackling documents from which it is drawn. Yet behind it are the men and deeds of the past. And sometimes as the student wearily searching his manuscripts lingers for a moment, he catches once more a gleam of this dead past. Almost he can see the groups assembling at the Cockpit or at Chelsea or at Powis House. Almost he can hear the solemn deliberation, the lively discussion, the opinions of the leaders, the objections of those who would lead but may not. Again he knows the commanding patience of Sir Robert, the industry and pettiness of Newcastle, the wisdom of Philip Yorke, the cunning of Pelham, the pathetic zeal of Sir John Norris, and the imperial arrogance of Pitt. Then the voices hush, the vision fades, and revery dies; and once more he holds in his hand the cryptic scrawl of some minister of bygone days or the minutes which some secretary of state prepared long ago for the king.

EDWARD RAYMOND TURNER.

<sup>94</sup> Temperley, *Eng. Hist. Rev.*, XXVII. 682.

## INFLUENCE OF THE CLERGY, AND OF RELIGIOUS AND SECTARIAN FORCES, ON THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

THE purpose of this paper is to assemble, so that they may be viewed and comprehended at one time, all those causes, remote and immediate, of the American Revolution, which are religious, sectarian, or ecclesiastical in character. This is not to argue that the Revolution was a holy war, or even that religious prejudices and the dissenting clergy were dominant forces, but it will be shown, I think, that the historical muse has been too much of a worldling, and has worshipped too partially the golden calf of economic causes.

When one enters on the search for the fountainhead of a great movement, one risks being tempted to go back and back until one reaches absurdity in the Garden of Eden. If, however, we go no further than John Adams, a contemporary, in his quest for causes of the Revolution, we shall at least have worthy authority. Writing to Jefferson, in 1818, he said: "I think, with you, that it is difficult to say at what moment the Revolution began. In my opinion, it began as early as the first plantation of the country. Independence of Church and Parliament was a fixed principle of our predecessors in 1620, as it was of Samuel Adams and Christopher Gadsden, in 1776."<sup>1</sup>

This, I take it, suggests that when the British government forced the Dissenters to leave England and flee to America, it simply put off for one hundred and fifty years, and removed to another land, the final struggle between those who represented the established church, feudal practice and tradition, the king's prerogative, landed property and privilege, on the one side; and their opponents on the other side, the radicals and liberals in Church and State, with antagonistic ideas as to church and secular government. Of course, the Pilgrims and Puritans of Plymouth and Massachusetts Bay, believers in the philosophy of Locke and the thinking of Milton, did not bring to America the conservative views of the divine right of kings, of monarchy, or of ecclesiastical tradition.<sup>2</sup> The Episcopal Church, upholding these ideas and the pretensions of the Stuarts, having driven many of the Dissenters out of England, seemed, for nearly a hundred years, content to be rid of them, but

<sup>1</sup> John Adams, *Works*, X. 313.

<sup>2</sup> Andrews, *Colonial Period*, p. 60.

as the colonies grew in importance, the church began to try to regain this lost opportunity for expansion. American resistance to this effort coincided with resistance to taxation. John Adams asserted that one reason for opposing taxation was that "if Parliament could tax us, they could establish the Church of England, with all its creeds, articles, tests, ceremonies, and tithes, and prohibit all other churches, as conventicles and schism shops."<sup>3</sup>

But before we take up the causes of the final bitterness that led directly to independence, we must see how, in the whole colonial period, controversies of a religious character kept the colonists suspicious of encroachment by the Anglican Church. The Puritans had been obliged, soon after their first settlement, to resist an attempt to transplant into their midst the institutions of feudalism and the seeds of privilege. The aristocratic Gorges, supporter of the Stuarts, believer in the kingly prerogative, tried to stop the Puritan growth by setting up a feudal proprietorship in their very midst. Archbishop Laud, hoping to see the Anglican Church supplant the Puritan in New England, gave his powerful aid, but, as if by miracle, the Puritans triumphed.<sup>4</sup> Again, it was the Episcopalian zeal of Andros, in the last years of the seventeenth century, that much aroused the wrath of the Puritans. In spite of their laws penalizing every observance of Christmas, Andros attended Anglican service on that day, "a redcoat . . . on his right hand and Captain George on his left", and sixty redcoated soldiers in the rear. In the spring, as if again to flout the "immodest godliness" of the Puritans, he even caused a Maypole to be set up, and thereupon Increase Mather became sure that "'the Devil' had begun his march of triumph". When the governor, in his Anglican zeal, established an Episcopalian minister in Boston, Puritan intolerance could see in him only "Baal's priest", and his prayers were "leeks, garlic and trash", while his church was a no less hateful thing than "Egypt's Babylon".<sup>5</sup>

<sup>3</sup> Adams, *Works*, X. 288. "And independence of Church and Parliament was always kept in view in this part of the country, and, I believe, in most others. The hierarchy and parliamentary authority ever were dreaded and detested even by a majority of professed Episcopalians." *Ibid.*, p. 313.

<sup>4</sup> Andrews, *Colonial Period*, pp. 36-39; Bradford, *History of Plymouth Plantation* ("Original Narratives" series), pp. 315-316.

<sup>5</sup> *Massachusetts Historical Society Collections*, seventh series, VII. 133; Channing, *History of the United States*, II. 174-175; Oliver, *Puritan Commonwealth*, pp. 446-450; *Massachusetts Historical Society Proceedings*, second series, XIII. 410-411. Edward Randolph also aroused Puritan wrath when he insisted upon tolerance for the Anglican Church in Massachusetts. Hutchinson, *Collection of Papers relative to Massachusetts Bay*, pp. 525-576 (especially 538); Oliver, *Puritan Commonwealth*, pp. 434-445; Doyle, *The English in America*, II. 268-269; Osgood, *American Colonies in the Seventeenth Century*, III. 390.

After 1700, the suspicions of the colonists were repeatedly aroused. First, when an effort was made to subject all corporate and proprietary governments to the direct control of the crown, the Anglican Church supported the plan with great zeal, as did the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, and all devout Episcopalians in the colonies, who saw in this their opportunity to overthrow in New England the power of the Puritans, and in Pennsylvania and New Jersey, that of the Quakers. It was not unnoticed that in England the Tories supported and the Whigs opposed this plan.<sup>6</sup>

Again and again, the dissenting sects in America took alarm as they noted the influence of the Bishop of London in getting American political plums for those who gave promise of being useful allies of the Anglican Church in America.<sup>7</sup> The bishop always seemed to understand that a profitable religion never wants proselytes. This same watchful shepherd of the Episcopalian flock was consulted repeatedly as to the laws affecting the interests of Anglican churchmen in America. Under his influence many laws fathered by the Dissenters were disallowed to their bitter disappointment and disgust.<sup>8</sup> A law of North Carolina giving Presbyterian ministers the right to perform the marriage ceremony was disallowed in England, because the Episcopalian clergy, not above six in number, would thus be deprived of their fees.<sup>9</sup> In some cases of interference of this kind even the Anglican churchmen in the colonies were offended. This was true when the Board of Trade recommended the disallowance of certain acts of the colonial legislatures providing for the disposal of Episcopalian parish property, reducing the salaries of church ministers, or providing for the punishment of ministers for immoral conduct—perhaps those described by Hammond, who “could babble in a pulpit and roar in a

<sup>6</sup> Andrews, *Colonial Period*, p. 143.

<sup>7</sup> Dexter, *Literary Diary of Ezra Stiles*, I. 54–55. No minister could be preferred to any benefice in America without certificate from the Bishop of London. No schoolmaster could go from England to the colonies without license from him. *Documents relative to the Colonial History of New York*, VII. 368–369 (Sherlock's report). William Penn's charter forced him to acknowledge the right of the Bishop of London to appoint ministers to Pennsylvania, if twenty colonists expressed that wish. Thorpe, *Constitutions and Charters*, etc., V. 3043.

<sup>8</sup> Root, *Relations of Pennsylvania with Great Britain*, pp. 228, 232; *Pennsylvania Statutes at Large*, II. 450, 480, 490; *Colonial Records of North Carolina*, VI. 716.

<sup>9</sup> Channing, *History of the United States*, III. 6, quoting Dickerson, *Colonial Government*, ch. V.; *Colonial Records of North Carolina*, VI. 715–716. Andros tried to place marriages in the hands of Anglican clergy. Hutchinson, *History of Massachusetts*, I. 318. Legal marriage in Virginia was by Anglican clergy only. McIlwaine, *Struggle . . . for Religious Toleration* (Johns Hopkins University Studies, XII., no. 4).



tavern".<sup>10</sup> Again Parliament passed laws encroaching on the general freedom of worship in the colonies,<sup>11</sup> an interference resented more or less by all sects. Though in general the Board of Trade sought to protect the interests of the established church, yet the graven image of commerce was never forgotten amidst the zeal for the true God, and the board did not neglect to enforce such a degree of toleration as would not check colonial growth and prosperity.<sup>12</sup> Even this last laudable activity of the board was often hateful to bigoted colonists, and became a cause of estrangement from the mother-country.

In addition to these actual acts of interference, we must remember that all governors, lieutenant-governors, secretaries, councillors, attorneys general, chief justices, customs-officers—all colonial officers, in fact, who were appointed by the British government—were "ruffle-shirted Episcopalians", and attended the Anglican Church.<sup>13</sup> This fact, especially in the northern colonies where an opposing sect was established, served to keep the British officials aloof religiously, and to make the Dissenters less willing to yield obedience to them. Moreover, these officers, thus isolated at this important point of social contact, lost that opportunity of understanding and sympathizing with the people. It was to an American public thus irritated by a nagging fear of intrusion by the Anglican Church, and out of sympathy with an Episcopalian officialdom, that there came, about the middle of the eighteenth century, a threat of the establishment of an American episcopate.

To repeat here the story of the struggle against the real or imaginary danger of the establishment of an American episcopate seems unnecessary after the prominence that has been given to that subject by Dr. Cross's exhaustive and scholarly study of *The Anglican Episcopate and the American Colonies*. It will suffice to state briefly his cautious judgment as to the importance of the controversy. "If the question of the establishment of bishops", he says, "did not contribute a lion's share in causing that enmity to the mother country . . . it was involved in the struggle and

<sup>10</sup> The Bishop of London was given a royal commission authorizing him to hold spiritual courts in America. *Documents relative to the Colonial History of New York*, V. 849. In South Carolina, such tribunals were employed for correcting the morals and irregularities of the clergy. Cross, *Anglican Episcopate*, pp. 80-86.

<sup>11</sup> Dickerson, *American Colonial Government*, p. 231.

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 232-233.

<sup>13</sup> For nearly one hundred years before the Revolution, royal governors were instructed to see that the Book of Common Prayer was read "each Sunday and Holy Day", and "the Blessed Sacrament administered according to the rules of the Church of England". *Documents relative to the Colonial History of New York*, VII. 362.

deserves to be regarded as an important part of it", and again, "it was at least one of the causes tending to . . . alienation".<sup>14</sup> Looking at the matter from another angle, he says later: "The strained relations which heralded the approach of the War of Independence strengthened the opposition to episcopacy, rather than that religious differences were a prime moving cause of political alienation."<sup>15</sup>

The truth is, that one studying only this contention against the Anglican episcopate, could not have a full realization of the significance of religious and sectarian forces in bringing on the Revolution. One must also study the work of Presbyterian and Congregationalist preachers who taught the political doctrines of Locke and Milton until the members of their congregations held the liberal theories of government which rendered them most sensitive to governmental oppression. Regard must be had for the extent to which revolutionary leaders made use of, or were affected by, religious convictions and sectarian prejudices. We must study the details of the wrangling among the Anglicans and Dissenters over other matters than the episcopate. Attention must be given to the demonstrable fact that in the war itself, north of the Mason and Dixon line at least, the Episcopalians became in a great majority Loyalists, while the Dissenters became Patriots. Even in the South, where a much larger proportion of Episcopalians came out on the Patriot side, it was, in Virginia especially, the Scotch-Irish Presbyterians and the German Dissenters that originally forced the conflict with England against the conservative planter Episcopalians.

Of these influences, the first and most important to study is that of the Calvinistic preachers. Some attention has been given to the activity of Jonathan Mayhew and Samuel Cooper because John Adams regarded them as prime movers, with Otis, Thacher, and Samuel Adams, for American liberty.<sup>16</sup> But a far more subtle influence than that which attracted John Adams's attention was the preaching by a large number of Congregational and Presbyterian ministers,<sup>17</sup> of the doctrines of political liberty which they had learned from their study of Sydney, Milton, Locke, and Hoadly,

<sup>14</sup> M. Chamberlain, *John Adams*, pp. 23, 25, note, 27; Brooks Adams, *Emancipation of Massachusetts*, pp. 314 et seq.; Cross, *Anglican Episcopate*, pp. 157, 214; Thornton, *Pulpit of the Revolution*, pp. 109, 110.

<sup>15</sup> Cross, *Anglican Episcopate*, p. 271.

<sup>16</sup> Adams, *Works*, X. 284. Chastellux also suggests Cooper's influence, *Travels in North America* (trans.), II. 281-283. Rev. Samuel Cooper seems to have been an intimate friend of John Hancock, and to have influenced him greatly.

<sup>17</sup> A. E. Dunning, *Congregationalists in America*, pp. 270, 275; *Notes and Queries*, fifth series, VI. 142; Kapp, *Life of Kalb*, p. 73. Kalb sent many of these sermons to Versailles (1764). *The Singular Happiness of Such Heads or Rulers, as are able to Choose out their People's Way: a brief Sermon Preached to the Great and General Assembly of the Province of Massachusetts Bay . . . May 28,*

apostles of free institutions, whose teachings had never before found such receptive minds as those in America.<sup>18</sup> Most Presbyterians and Congregationalists of New England looked upon themselves as lineal descendants of the Puritans, and as such they felt bound to defend the Puritan Revolution. Bookish men, as most of the New England clergy were, found a mine of arguments, political weapons for that defense, in the writings of Locke and Milton. Upon the mellowing of occasion, preachers rarely failed to draw upon these sources, and they often stated Locke's theories more clearly than Locke himself. Many of the sermons had no hint of discontent, no incitement to rebellion, but merely an unimpassioned exposition of the political theories of the Puritan writers on government, of a century or more before. People living in an open-minded frontier community and nourished with such intellectual pabulum as this, would never be content to be governed arbitrarily by a government three thousand miles distant and not of their own making.

In these sermons, the congregations were told of Locke's doctrine that it was the people's right to choose their own rulers and to fix the bounds of their authority. They were taught that government was accountable to the people and that the New England charter had been a compact between the sovereign and the first patentees.<sup>19</sup> Samuel Davies, the eloquent Virginia preacher to whom Patrick Henry listened from his eleventh to his twenty-second year, taught that the British constitution was "but the voluntary compact of sovereign and subject."<sup>20</sup> Henry declared, "government is a conditional compact between king and people . . . a violation of the covenant by either party discharges the other from obligation."

A Connecticut preacher, early in the seventeenth century, was teaching that: "The choice of public magistrates belongs unto the people, by God's own allowance. They who have the power to appoint officers and magistrates, it is in their power, also, to set the bounds and limitations of the power and place unto which they call them."<sup>21</sup> If there is truth in the old adage, "like priest, like people", New England was no healthy place for absolutism.

1701 (Boston, 1701); *The Duty of Civil Rulers: an Election Sermon*, by E. Dorr (Hartford, 1765); *Works of John Witherspoon* (Philadelphia, 1800), I. 319-344. Titles of many more of these sermons will appear later in this article.

<sup>18</sup> Thornton, *Pulpit of the Revolution*, pp. xxxiii, 46; Stillé, *Life and Times of John Dickinson*, I. 29-31, 77; *Notes and Queries*, fifth series, VI. 142.

<sup>19</sup> Thornton, *Pulpit of the Revolution*, pp. 159, 175.

<sup>20</sup> Samuel Davies, *Sermons*, III. 80. There is little doubt that Davies was Henry's model in public speaking. *Ibid.*, I. 21; H. A. White, *Southern Presbyterian Leaders*, pp. 52-56, 104.

<sup>21</sup> Lord Acton, *Lectures*, p. 311. Mayhew, more than one hundred years later than the Connecticut preacher, makes the same argument; see Thornton, *Pulpit of the Revolution*, p. 61.

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XIX.—4.

New England ministers, along with their "three mile prayers and half mile graces", at which their critics jeered, were preaching, too, that people were justified in rising even against the sovereign himself in order "to redress their grievances; to vindicate their natural and legal rights; to break the yoke of tyranny".<sup>22</sup> This they reasoned from the natural freedom of man, basing their arguments upon the ideas of Milton, Sydney, and Locke.<sup>23</sup> From the earliest times in fact, the ministers had taught the duty to God and the fear of offending God, but had not worried their flocks about their duty to kings or with the fear of offending them.<sup>24</sup> "Honor . . . and obedience to good rulers, and a spirited opposition to bad ones", was the burden of some New England preaching, wrote John Adams.<sup>25</sup> "If", he said again, "the orators on the 4th of July really wish to investigate the principles and feelings which produced the Revolution, they ought to study . . . Dr. Mayhew's sermon on passive obedience and non-resistance."<sup>26</sup> This famous sermon of Mayhew attracted Adams's attention because of its boldness, but the thesis was an old one, and much dwelt upon later by the dissenting ministers of New England. They were driven to it in defense of their rebellious Puritan ancestors,<sup>27</sup> and out of mere

<sup>22</sup> Thornton, *Pulpit of the Revolution*, p. 62.

<sup>23</sup> Stillé, *Life and Times of Dickinson*, I. 31, 77; Thornton, *Pulpit of the Revolution*, pp. xxxiii and xxxiv. Dean Tucker calls attention to "the evil Consequences arising from the Propagation of Mr. Locke's democratical Principles". *Four Letters on Important National Subjects*, p. 89. See also Masson, *Life of Milton*, V. 647; Milton, *Defence of the People of England* and *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates*; and Locke, *Essay on Government*. Milton wrote: "That no unbridled potentate or tyrant, but to his sorrow, for the future may presume such high and irrepressible license over mankind, to havoc and turn upside down whole kingdoms of men, as though they were no more in respect to his perverse will than a nation of pismires." And again, "Our liberty is not Caesar's; it is a blessing we have received from God himself . . . to lay down this at Caesar's feet, which we derive not from him . . . were an unworthy action, and a degrading of our very nature. . . . Being, therefore, peculiarly God's own . . . we are entirely free by nature, and cannot . . . be reduced into a condition of slavery to any man, especially to a wicked, unjust, cruel tyrant." Thornton, *Pulpit of the Revolution*, pp. 62, 83.

<sup>24</sup> Andrews, *Colonial Period*, p. 84.

<sup>25</sup> Adams, *Works*, II. 167-168.

<sup>26</sup> Adams, *Works*, X. 301. See *A Discourse concerning unlimited Submission and Non-resistance to the Higher Powers*, etc., by J. Mayhew (Boston, 1750, pp. 55); *Remarks on an Anonymous Tract* (1764), by J. Mayhew, a reply to an attack on the above. James Otis was much influenced by Mayhew, who seems, indeed, to have suggested to him the idea of revolutionary committees and of union. Thornton, *Pulpit of the Revolution*, p. 44. Robert Treat Paine used to hear Mayhew at the West Church, and greatly admired him. Davol, *Two Men of Taunton*, p. 77.

<sup>27</sup> John Witherspoon's attitude is a typical one (1758). "The noble struggle which many in England made, about an hundred years ago, for their liberties sacred and civil, still bears the name of the grand rebellion". *Works of John Witherspoon*, I. 326.

oppugnance to Episcopalian teachings. The young candidates for the Anglican clergy were taught at Oxford that submission and obedience, clear, absolute, and without exception, was the badge and character of the Church of England.<sup>28</sup> The Anglican clergy were compelled to read on the anniversary of the death of Charles I. the Oxford homily "against disobedience and wilful rebellion", or to preach a sermon against that sin.<sup>29</sup> Mayhew indulged in only modest hyperbole when he charged the Anglican clergy with teaching that if kings oppress, and prayers and entreaties fail, we must all "suffer ourselves to be robbed and butchered at the pleasure of the 'Lord's anointed', lest we should incur the sin of rebellion and the punishment of damnation".<sup>30</sup>

The scorn of the Puritan for such doctrines is also well shown in John Adams's article in the *Boston Gazette* (1765) wherein he asserts: "The adventurers [New England Puritans] . . . had an utter contempt of all that dark ribaldry of hereditary, indefeasible right,—the Lord's anointed,—and the divine, miraculous, original of government, with which priesthood had enveloped the feudal monarch in clouds and mysteries, and from whence they had deduced the most mischievous of all doctrines, that of passive obedience, and non-resistance".<sup>31</sup> Adams did not like it when Mr. Gay on the day of Thanksgiving said, "the ancient weapons of the church were prayers and tears, not clubs". This, he thought, inculcated submission to authority in pretty strong terms.<sup>32</sup>

In refutation of the submission doctrine, Mayhew preached the right of people to free themselves from inglorious servitude and ruin. "It is upon this principle that many royal oppressors have been driven . . . into banishment, and many slain by the hands of their subjects . . . that Tarquin was expelled from Rome, and Julius Caesar . . . cut off in the senate-house . . . that King Charles

<sup>28</sup> Thornton, *Pulpit of the Revolution*, p. 41; Adams, *Works*, X. 187.

<sup>29</sup> Thornton, *Pulpit of the Revolution*, p. 42. Now and then one was hardy enough to omit it. See Dexter, *Literary Diary of Stiles*, I. 339-340. A favorite text among the Anglican clergy was Romans xiii. 1-8: "Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God; the powers that be are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God: and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation." See Mayhew's reasoning on this, Thornton, *Pulpit of the Revolution*, p. 53. There were, to be sure, low churchmen like Benjamin Hoadly, who had the same view as Mayhew on this subject.

<sup>30</sup> Thornton, *Pulpit of the Revolution*, p. 63. One must remember in reading Mayhew's sermons that he and his views were discussed far and wide in Massachusetts. See Adams, *Works*, II. 4.

<sup>31</sup> Adams, *Works*, III. 454. See also Samuel Adams on this subject; Wells, *Life of Samuel Adams*, I. 245.

<sup>32</sup> Adams, *Works*, II. 167-168.

I. was beheaded before his own banqueting-house . . . that King James II. was made to fly that country which he aimed at enslaving."<sup>33</sup> When Patrick Henry, a few years later, expressed such ideas in the Virginia House of Burgesses, he was greeted with shouts of "Treason! treason!". Mayhew banned the submission doctrine with bell, book, and candle, declaring: "The hereditary, indefeasible, divine right of kings, and the doctrine of non-resistance, which is built upon the supposition of such a right, are altogether as fabulous . . . as transubstantiation, or any of the most absurd reveries of ancient or modern visionaries".<sup>34</sup> "How does this prove", asked Mayhew, "that those who resist a lawless, unreasonable power, which is contrary to the will of God, do therein resist the will and ordinance of God?"<sup>35</sup> Mayhew also ridiculed Charles I., in the rôle of "blessed saint" and "royal martyr". Rather was he a "man black with guilt" and "laden with iniquity", a "burlesque" upon saintship and martyrdom. A tyrant, such as he, was "a messenger of Satan to buffet us".<sup>36</sup> Such doctrines so clearly hark back to the days of Cromwell that we can understand why that charitable and Christian gentleman, Rev. Arthur Browne, stepping forth in the beauty of holiness, accused Mayhew of licking up the "spittle" of his Puritan predecessors and coughing "it out again, with some additions of his own filth and phlegm".<sup>37</sup>

To this point, we have had to do with political doctrines taught to New England congregations before the day of any of those measures of the British government which are commonly regarded as the causes of the American Revolution. As these measures—the Stamp Act, the Townshend Acts, the Tea Act, and others—came forth to plague the Americans, the Puritan pulpits "thundered", to use John Adams's expression,<sup>38</sup> and more and more emphasis was given to the idea of the right of resistance.<sup>39</sup> On August 25, 1765, Mayhew preached from the text: "I would they were even cut off which trouble you." When, soon after, a mob destroyed Hutchin-

<sup>33</sup> Thornton, *Pulpit of the Revolution*, pp. 62–63. He might have taken his text from Milton, "It is not, neither ought to be, the glory of a Protestant state never to have put their king to death; it is the glory of a Protestant king never to have deserved death." Milton, *The Tenure of Kings and Magistrates*, quoted in Thornton, *Pulpit of the Revolution*, p. 62, note.

<sup>34</sup> Thornton, *Pulpit of the Revolution*, p. 84. See also p. 86, note a, and pp. 70, 73, 75, 78, 82. See Witherspoon on the same subject, *Works*, I. 326.

<sup>35</sup> Twenty-five years later, John Adams was proclaiming the same doctrine. Thornton, *Pulpit of the Revolution*, p. 75 and note.

<sup>36</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 73–74, note, 99. Stiles has a like attitude in his *Literary Diary*, I. 34–35.

<sup>37</sup> Cross, *Anglican Episcopate*, p. 150.

<sup>38</sup> Adams, *Works*, II. 154.

<sup>39</sup> Stillé, *Life and Times of Dickinson*, I. 77.



son's house, a ringleader, who was seized, is said to have excused his actions on the ground that he was excited by the sermon, "and that he thought he was doing God service".<sup>40</sup> Charles Chauncey, one of the most eminent divines in America, preached against the act with power and learning, and on its repeal, preached a memorable sermon, filled with liberal political doctrines, from the text: "As cold waters to a thirsty soul, so is good news from a far country".<sup>41</sup> Samuel Stillman, a Baptist, also denounced the Stamp Act from his pulpit in Boston,<sup>42</sup> while John Zubly, a German Lutheran minister in Georgia, taking for his text the words—later used with the same significance by Lincoln—"A house divided against itself cannot stand", boldly denied the British right to tax.<sup>43</sup>

The Boston Massacre was piously magnified by New England divines, Rev. John Lothrop preaching upon the "Innocent Blood Crying to God from the Streets of Boston".<sup>44</sup> Rev. Samuel Cooke's sermon on this occasion was filled with the doctrines of Locke, and the Massachusetts house of representatives resolved that it be printed in the public press.<sup>45</sup> On the anniversary of the Massacre in 1772, Dr. Chauncey preached a sermon in the Old South Church, and then Joseph Warren stepped into the pulpit, which was hung with black cloth, and delivered an oration on the danger of standing armies. In a sermon preached before the governor and council, Mr. Tucker discussed the origin and design of government, and the sacredness of compacts. "The people", he declared, "as well as their rulers are the proper judges of the civil constitution they are under. . . . Unlimited submission is not due to government in a

<sup>40</sup> Hutchinson, *History of Massachusetts*, III. 123.

<sup>41</sup> *A Discourse on "the Good News from a Far Country"* (on the repeal of the Stamp Act), by Charles Chauncey (Boston, 1766); also in Thornton, *Pulpit of the Revolution*, pp. 114, 119, 133.

<sup>42</sup> T. Armitage, *History of the Baptists*, p. 781. Other sermons on this occasion were: (a) *Divine Providence Illustrated and Improved*, a Thanksgiving discourse preached in the Presbyterian or Congregational Church in Providence by David S. Rowland (1766); (b) *Some Important Observations, Occasioned by, and Adapted to the Public Fast, Ordered by Authority, December 18th, 1765*, by Stephen Johnson (Newport, 1766).

<sup>43</sup> *An Humble Inquiry into the Nature of the Dependency of the American Colonies upon the Parliament of Great Britain and the Right of Parliament to Lay Taxes on the Said Colonies*, by John J. Zubly (Savannah, 1769).

<sup>44</sup> Hearing that Governor Hutchinson would pardon the soldiers, Dr. Chauncey, in his pulpit, cried: "Surely he would not counteract the operation of the law both of God and of man . . . surely he would not make himself a partaker in the guilt of murder, by putting a stop to the shedding of their blood who have murderously spilt the blood of others." Hutchinson, *History of Massachusetts*, III. 329, note.

<sup>45</sup> Thornton, *Pulpit of the Revolution*, pp. 147, 153. The text was: "He that ruleth over men must be just, ruling in the fear of God." It was listened to by the lieutenant-governor, council, and house of representatives.



free state."<sup>46</sup> Upon every event in that series that led to a war for independence, the influence of New England's dissenting clergy may clearly be seen.<sup>47</sup>

But notwithstanding all of these sermons, and the liberal political doctrines which they imparted, one may ask whether any heed was given to them. In the days of New England's foundation, political leadership as well as moral guidance was beyond question with the clergy, and only the commandments of God took precedence over their teachings. Many of the political doctrines noted above were inculcated in those days, and even in the eighteenth century, when the influence of the "elders" had declined, their council and advice was eagerly sought.<sup>48</sup> No Englishman knew more of American conditions than Governor Pownall, and in a speech in Parliament in 1769, he refers to the leadership of the New England clergy, and the probable unifying effect they would have. "The spirit of their religion will", he cried, "like Moses' serpent, devour every other passion and affection".<sup>49</sup> The statement of Samuel Adams that the people of New England were not "priest-ridden", and that of John Adams that "the clergy have little influence . . . beyond that which their own piety, virtues, and talents naturally give them",<sup>50</sup> does not militate against this view, for the "brace of Adamses" wrote these opinions, having in mind a comparison with Catholic countries. In the same breath, John Adams testified that the clergy were "jealous friends of liberty". His letters show him to have constantly sought their advice on public affairs, finding them "zealous in the cause", and agreeing with him that the British measures would "ruin the liberties of the country".<sup>51</sup>

It must be remembered too that the pulpit was in that day the most direct and effectual way of reaching the masses—far out-rivalling the newspaper, then only in its infancy. In New England, moreover, a sermon was always preached as a part of the imposing ceremony of the election. This was not a mere compli-

<sup>46</sup> *Diary of Stiles*, I. 218; Headley, *Chaplains and Clergy of the Revolution*, p. 26.

<sup>47</sup> *Diary of Stiles*, I. 103, 184.

<sup>48</sup> Sabine, *Loyalists*, p. 51; Stillé, *Life and Times of Dickinson*, I. 29-31; Eddis, *Letters*, pp. 46-49; Thornton, *Pulpit of the Revolution*, p. xxxvi; *Familiar Letters of John Adams*, pp. 5, 6. In this connection it is interesting to note that in Evans's *Bibliography of Books printed in the United States* we find that over two-thirds of the books and pamphlets printed in the colonies in the first half of the eighteenth century were on religious subjects. From 1750 to 1775 about one-half are on these subjects. The writings of the clergy, therefore, would seem to have been in demand.

<sup>49</sup> *American Archives*, fifth series, II. 390.

<sup>50</sup> Samuel Adams, *Writings*, II. 195-196; Adams, *Works*, V. 495.

<sup>51</sup> Adams, *Works*, II. 11, 329, 424.

ment to religion, for after 1750, certainly, the sermons were listened to as a source of political instruction. By legislative resolution they were published in pamphlet form, and were scattered through the colony, becoming in some cases a sort of text of civil rights. They boldly attacked the question of the nature of compacts and charters as they affected the relations of the colonies to England. They discussed the origin, nature, and end of government, and the rights of man, and asserted that all laws were designed for the good of the governed.<sup>52</sup>

That the revolutionary leaders courted the support of the clergy is shown by many facts, one of which was the banquet given (1770) by the "Merchants and other Sons of Liberty" to the ministers in Faneuil Hall.<sup>53</sup> A little earlier, a Tory, describing the Revolutionary Whig gatherings, said: "Garrets were crowded with patriots; mechanics and lawyers, porters and clergymen, huddled promiscuously into them."<sup>54</sup>

During the last years of agitation, 1773 to 1775, the activity of the Puritan ministry became more and more marked. Rev. Charles Turner in his election sermon, 1773, denied that ministers should not meddle in politics. "It is their duty to interfere", he cried, "where the liberties of the land are assailed. . . . Religious liberty is so blended with civil, that if one falls it is not to be expected that the other will continue." The first provincial congress of Massachusetts acknowledged "with profound gratitude the public obligation to the ministry, as friends of civil and religious liberty", asking their aid to enforce the resolutions of the Continental Congress.<sup>55</sup> The justices of the court of general sessions, addressing General Gage, regretted that "some whose business it is to preach the gospel of Christ" were trying to "destroy the harmony of society", and General Gage, replying, was piously shocked that ministers "shamefully pervert the duties of their sacred functions".<sup>56</sup> In a proclamation, Gage declared that "the name of God has been introduced in the pulpits to excite and justify devastation and massacre", and he refused the assembly, when they asked him to appoint a fast day, for, he said, "the request was only to give an opportunity for sedition to flow from the pulpit".<sup>57</sup> Nor was this confined to New

<sup>52</sup> Preachers like Mayhew and Cooper seem to have known as much of the science of government as Otis and the Adamses. Headley, *Chaplains of the Revolution*, pp. 22, 25-40.

<sup>53</sup> *Diary of Stiles*, I. 54-55.

<sup>54</sup> Frothingham, *Life and Times of Joseph Warren*, pp. 50, 51.

<sup>55</sup> Headley, *Chaplains of the Revolution*, p. 27; Thornton, *Pulpit of the Revolution*, p. xxxi.

<sup>56</sup> *Rivington's Gazetteer*, July 21, 1774.

<sup>57</sup> *The Remembrancer*, I. 127 (1775); Headley, *Chaplains of the Revolution*, p. 59.

England, for Governor Martin in North Carolina declared in his proclamation (August, 1775) that "the tools of sedition" were "extravagantly profaning even the most sacred name of the Almighty" to excite rebellion.<sup>58</sup> Governor Hutchinson asserted that men were incited to rebellion by "some of the clergy who make the highest pretence to devotion".<sup>59</sup> Reverend Samuel Peters in Connecticut bemoaned that "spiritual iniquity rides in high places, with halberts, pistols, and swords . . . preachers and magistrates left the pulpit, etc., for the gun and drum . . . cursing the king and Lord North . . . and the Church of England".<sup>60</sup>

In fact, both Whig and Tory preachers often made a recruiting house of the sanctuary.<sup>61</sup> Perhaps the most famous and picturesque example of this was Mühlenberg, "Peter the Devil", as he was dubbed, who was pastor of a German church in the Shenandoah Valley. In January, 1776, he preached from Ecclesiastes, "A time of war, and a time of peace". As his sermon ended, he declared: "There is a time to fight, and the time is here." Removing his clerical gown, he appeared in a colonel's uniform; whereupon, three hundred men of his congregation enlisted under him.<sup>62</sup>

After Concord and Lexington, the dissenting clergy in every section of the country took up the work of arousing the people. In Philadelphia, the fugitive Loyalist, Curwen, heard in the Arch Street Meeting-House a truly American patriotic sermon, "pathetically lamenting the evils we are suffering from wicked and tyrannical ministers; exhorting us manfully to oppose them".<sup>63</sup> Silas Deane also listened, in a Philadelphia church, to a warm "Son of Liberty", as he ardently wrote his wife, Elizabeth.<sup>64</sup> John Adams, on his arrival in the City of Brotherly Love, thought the clergy there "but now beginning to engage in politics", but "they engage with a fervor that will produce wonderful effects". Those "of every

<sup>58</sup> *American Archives*, fourth series, III. 65.

<sup>59</sup> Frothingham, *Life and Times of Joseph Warren*, p. 204.

<sup>60</sup> Thornton, *Pulpit of the Revolution*, p. 195.

<sup>61</sup> Sabine, *Loyalists*, p. 51. *Diary of Stiles*, I. 484; some entries are: (November 17, 1774) "East Guilford 83 armed with Mr. Todd their pastor. . . . Haddam—100 armed—animated by Rev. Mr. May. . . . Chatham—100, marched with Rev. Mr. Boardman Pastor." *The Remembrancer*, I. 76 (1775); Thornton, *Pulpit of the Revolution*, p. xxxvi; Headley, *Chaplains of the Revolution*, p. 118; Frothingham, *Life and Times of Joseph Warren*, p. 404; *American Archives*, fifth series, I. 195.

<sup>62</sup> H. A. Muhlenberg, *Life of Peter Muhlenberg*, pp. 52-53; Bittinger, *American Lutheran Biographies*, p. 541. Other Lutheran preachers were almost as fervid in their patriotism, for example, Streit, Martin, Nussman, Butler, and Rabenhorst. See Bittinger, *German Religious Life*, p. 129.

<sup>63</sup> S. Curwen, *Journal*, p. 27 (May 7, 1775).

<sup>64</sup> *New York Historical Society Collections* (1886), *The Deane Papers*, I. 17.

denomination" . . . "thunder and lighten every Sabbath".<sup>65</sup> To North Carolina, we are told, the Presbyterian ministers came down from Pennsylvania to convert the Scotch-Irish Presbyterians of the back country to the Patriot cause.<sup>66</sup> But this was hardly necessary, for the Scotch-Irish Presbyterian preachers, like Charles Cummings and William Graham, were great admirers of Locke, whose doctrines they preached, and they led their people into the revolutionary movement, either fighting or preaching with them during the war.<sup>67</sup> In South Carolina, John Harris, Presbyterian minister at Ninety-Six, boldly stamped his republican ideas on his congregation, boasting that every man in it was a Whig. Tradition has it that he preached with a gun in his pulpit and a powder horn suspended about his neck.<sup>68</sup> Dr. Zubly in Georgia was so zealous in the cause that he was sent to the Continental Congress by his Whig constituency.<sup>69</sup> These are but typical instances of the activity of the clergy, and might be multiplied many times from the extant records.

Many of the sermons and pious exhortations of this critical period have come down to us.<sup>70</sup> They preached, though more boldly in this period than earlier, the liberal thinking of the Puritan philosophers, and against the doctrine of non-resistance. The people have the right, contended one, from "the sacred and inalienable Charter of the Almighty to . . . alter the Government under which they live" if this is for the general good. "The

<sup>65</sup> *Familiar Letters of John Adams*, pp. 65, 76, 90.

<sup>66</sup> *North Carolina Colonial Records*, X. 173; Jones, *Defence . . . of North Carolina*, p. 230. In Maryland, too, some were active. *American Archives*, fourth series, III. 10; McCrady, *History of South Carolina*, II. 456. In 1775 the vestries of the German Lutheran and Reformed churches of Philadelphia sent a pamphlet of forty pages to the Germans of New York and North Carolina urging them to support the cause of Congress. Mann, *Life of H. M. Muhlenberg*, p. 485.

<sup>67</sup> H. B. Grigsby, in *Washington and Lee Historical Papers*, no. 2, pp. 19, 39.

<sup>68</sup> McCrady, *History of South Carolina*, II. 454.

<sup>69</sup> Adams, *Works*, II. 421-422; *Diary of Stiles*, I. 545-546. Later Zubly seemed to go over to the Loyalist side.

<sup>70</sup> See especially W. D. Love, *Fast and Thanksgiving Days*, pp. 545 *et seq.*; Thornton, *Pulpit of the Revolution*. In addition to these, the following are some of the best known: *The Law of Liberty: a Sermon on American Affairs*, preached at the opening of the Provincial Congress of Georgia, 1775, by John J. Zubly; *An Oration Delivered March 15, 1775, at the request of . . . Inhabitants of Boston*, by Dr. Thomas Bolton (Boston); *A Sermon Preached before the Honorable Congress of the Colony of the Massachusetts Bay, in New England*, by Samuel Langdon (Watertown, 1775); *The Snare Broken! a Thanksgiving Sermon on Occasion of the repeal of the Stamp Act*, by J. Mayhew (Boston, 1766); *A Sermon Preached before the Honorable Council and the Honorable House of Representatives of the Colony of Massachusetts Bay in New England, May 29, 1776*, by Samuel West (Boston); *An Oration in Memory of General Montgomery*, by William Smith (Philadelphia, 1776); *A Discourse Preached December 15, 1774; Thanksgiving Sermon*, by William Gordon (Boston, 1775).

Supreme Being", averred another, "hath left it in our power to choose what Government we please for our civil and religious happiness". The nature and design of government was discussed, and it was affirmed that "there are no laws, where there are no representatives of the people for whom they are . . . made".<sup>71</sup>

"Will we", asks the Rev. William Gordon, "conform to the once exploded but again courtly doctrine of passive obedience and non-resistance, rather than hazard life and property?" This doctrine of unlimited passive obedience is "contrary to natural law", declared Samuel West.<sup>72</sup> "Self-preservation . . . the first law of nature cannot be contradicted by any social or national obligation", cried another sacerdotal dogmatist. "The man who refuses to assert his right to liberty, property, and life, is guilty of . . . high treason against God."<sup>73</sup> The Bible was raked with a fine Calvinistic comb for every quotation seeming to give divine sanction for resistance to Great Britain.<sup>74</sup> John Adams was pleased when the preacher, Mr. Duffield, "ran a parallel between the case of Israel and that of America; and between the conduct of Pharaoh and that of George".<sup>75</sup> When Rev. Samuel Langdon preached a sermon full of democratic ideas from the text, "As a roaring lion and a ranging bear, so is a wicked ruler over the poor people", the provincial congress of Massachusetts voted that a copy of the sermon be sent "to each minister in the colony and to each member of the Congress".

Common themes in the sermons of '75 and '76 were the necessity of obedience to the measures of the Continental Congress lest disunion should result,<sup>76</sup> and the wickedness of Britain, "that with merciless and unhallowed hands wouldst cut down and destroy this branch of thine own vine".<sup>77</sup> Chastellux, travelling in America, admired the address with which a young minister speaking "reasonably enough for a preacher", introduced politics into his sermon, comparing "Christians redeemed by the blood of Jesus Christ, but still compelled to fight against the flesh and sin, to the Thirteen United States" fighting with England to preserve liberty and independence.<sup>78</sup> There was truth enough in the Loyalists' reports of sermons aiming to "animate and inflame the minds of the Rebels,

<sup>71</sup> *American Archives*, fourth series, II. 230; Thornton, *Pulpit of the Revolution*, p. 303.

<sup>72</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 203, 272.

<sup>73</sup> *American Archives*, fourth series, I. 335.

<sup>74</sup> *Ibid.*, II. 149-151.

<sup>75</sup> *Familiar Letters of John Adams*, p. 173.

<sup>76</sup> Thornton, *Pulpit of the Revolution*, pp. 231, 232.

<sup>77</sup> Tyler, *Literary History of the American Revolution*, II. 287.

<sup>78</sup> Chastellux, *Travels in North America*, II. 228.

and depreciate the Britons".<sup>79</sup> From the Loyalist point of view, such preachers were all that William Gordon's opponent, speaking "most invectively", called him; "fire-brand of sedition . . . war-faring priest . . . Christian sower of sedition . . . church-militant general", preaching "carnage and blood".<sup>80</sup>

Not only were the dissenting clergy making every effort to fan the flames of rebellion, but some of the more astute Whig leaders were using religious and sectarian forces in a more or less conscious way to the same end. No one can study closely the work of Samuel Adams, "the Man of the Revolution", without realizing how far he himself was actuated by religious prejudices, and the extent to which he worked upon the religious passions of others. A stern Calvinist, observant of religious ceremonies, he had all the Puritan hatred of Anglican episcopacy and Roman papacy. His natural affiliations were with the Puritan clergy, and he used them to the utmost for political purposes. It was worthy of St. Ignatius, as Brooks Adams says, "the way Samuel Adams used the toleration, granted the Canadian Catholics by the Quebec Bill, as a goad wherewith to inflame the dying Puritan fanaticism". Holy water and papal bulls were special objects of Puritan hatred, and Adams made his fellow-citizens fear that they were in danger of both.

After the "Great Awakening" (1740), religious fervor had fallen into a decline, and there were many even in New England who had ceased to attend divine service. By the time of the Revolution, there were sad apostates who did not believe that infants unbaptized would be eternally damned, and that "beauty and pleasure, comfort and joy were offensive in the sight of God",<sup>81</sup> yet Samuel Adams, and others taking their cue from him, so aroused the latent Puritan bigotry that pre-revolutionary literature is filled with denunciations of the wise act of the British government, recognizing the Roman Catholic religion in the province of Quebec.<sup>82</sup> Even in an address to the Mohawk Indians, Adams appealed to the religious passions. "Brothers,—They have made a law to establish the religion of the Pope in Canada, which lies so near you. We much fear some of your children may be induced, instead of worshipping the only true God, to pay his dues to images made with

<sup>79</sup> *American Archives*, fifth series, II. 564; fourth series, V. 1275.

<sup>80</sup> Thornton, *Pulpit of the Revolution*, p. 196.

<sup>81</sup> Andrews, *Colonial Period*, p. 85.

<sup>82</sup> *American Archives*, fourth series, I. 180, 184, 189, 194, 202-203, 204, 205, 206, 212, 215-216, 218, 498-499, 513, 708-709, 777, 801, 816, 853-854, 912, 920-921, 959, 1104, 1146-1147, 1310, 1313, 1315, 1824-1825, 1828, 1831, 1836-1837, 1845, 1846, 1847.

their own hands."<sup>83</sup> Again and again the Americans were asked whether they would "submit to Popery and Slavery".

How real this danger seemed to them, we can comprehend only when we recall their traditional fear and hatred of the Roman Church and of the Catholic French in Canada. In 1745, the Puritan expedition against Louisburg was a crusade. On their flag was the motto, "*Nil desperandum, Christo duce*". One of the chaplains is said to have carried a hatchet to destroy images in Catholic churches, and one old deacon wrote: "Oh that I could be with you and dear parson Moody in that church, to destroy the images there set up."<sup>84</sup> It was a regular colonial custom at the time of the Revolution that the pope and the Devil were religiously burned on Guy Fawkes Day. Calvinists were ready to believe any yarn concerning Catholic deceit and cunning. William Livingston (1755) stoutly affirmed that the French persuaded the Indians that the Virgin Mary was born in Paris, and that our Saviour was crucified at London by the English.<sup>85</sup> To Jeremy Belknap, the Church of Rome was "the mother of harlots and abominations". Samuel Adams, in 1768, "verily believed", that "much more is to be dreaded from the growth of Popery in America, than from Stamp-Acts or *any other* Acts destructive of mens *civil* rights".<sup>86</sup> He thought one should be very cautious in talking about popery before youth, lest unwittingly one should speak "the language of the Beast".<sup>87</sup> John Adams, too, was alarmed (1771) that "the barriers against popery, erected by our ancestors, are suffered to be destroyed, to the hazard even of the Protestant religion".<sup>88</sup> He was much pleased that "the rascally Roman Catholics" of Braintree did not dare show themselves. Jonathan Mayhew and Ezra Stiles, powerful ecclesiastical figures in New England, were both violently prejudiced against the "Romish church".<sup>89</sup>

When we find bigotry like this in the minds of American leaders, we are not surprised that a favorite device on the banners carried by

<sup>83</sup> *Writings of Samuel Adams*, III. 213.

<sup>84</sup> U. Parsons, *Life of Pepperrell* (third ed.), p. 52. See Cotton Mather's *Diary*, *Mass. Hist. Soc. Coll.*, seventh series, VII. 572; VIII. 30; Burrage, *Maine at Louisburg*, pp. 17, 25, 45; Belknap, *History of New Hampshire*, p. 272; *Atlantic Monthly*, LXVII. 318, 514 (1891).

<sup>85</sup> Sedgwick, *William Livingston*, pp. 97-98. He spoke of the "superstitious rites and fantastic trumperies of popery". See also Adams, *Works*, II. 5.

<sup>86</sup> Samuel Adams, *Writings*, I. 201, 203. See also Davies, *Sermons*, I. 21; III. 120, 146.

<sup>87</sup> Samuel Adams, *Writings*, I. 209, 210.

<sup>88</sup> Adams, *Works*, II. 252. His antipathy toward Catholics appears repeatedly. *Ibid.*, II. 5; III. 254, 268; X. 188.

<sup>89</sup> Tyler, *Literary History of the American Revolution*, I. 133-134; *Diary of Stiles*, I. 455, 490.



Puritan mobs, after the Quebec Act, was the demand "no Popery",<sup>90</sup> and that one of the motives animating the captors of Ticonderoga, was to secure the colonies from the incursions of the Roman Catholics, "those children of darkness".<sup>91</sup> Ezra Stiles was astonished that the king and Lords and Commons, a whole Protestant Parliament—even the bishops concurring—should establish the Romish Church and "Idolatry" over three-quarters of their empire;<sup>92</sup> and he preached on "the Nature and Danger of Popery in this Land". It was, thought one of Silas Deane's friends, the finishing stroke for the British ministry.<sup>93</sup> Judge Drayton, in South Carolina, having in mind the ministry's effort to establish the Roman Catholic religion, pictured "the flames which are lighted, blown up, and fed with blood by the Roman Catholic doctrines; doctrines . . . which tend to establish a most cruel tyranny in Church and State—a tyranny under which all Europe groaned for many ages".<sup>94</sup> A citizen of the county of Hampshire addressing the inhabitants of Massachusetts, expressed his forebodings that, "As a single amour induced one King to change the National Religion from the Roman Catholick to the Protestant, so a passion not more justifiable, though perhaps less personal, may influence some future Monarch to barter away the Protestant for the religion of the Canadians".<sup>95</sup>

Public assemblies as well as individuals made their solemn protest. The New York assembly expostulated with the British government, and the famous Suffolk resolves deprecated the act as "dangerous in extreme degree to the Protestant religion".<sup>96</sup> The Continental Congress approved of these resolves, and took the same ground, as to the Catholic menace, in their addresses to the people of Great Britain and to the colonies.<sup>97</sup> It does not matter that Congress, a few months later, when it saw the advantage of allying Canada with the American Union, "perceived the fate of the Catholic and Protestant to be strongly linked together",<sup>98</sup> for the earlier sentiments were the real, and the later the feigned ones.

<sup>90</sup> *American Archives*, fourth series, II. 48.

<sup>91</sup> *The Remembrancer*, I. 119 (1775); *American Archives*, fourth series, III. 637.

<sup>92</sup> *Diary of Stiles*, I. 455, 490. This act was connected with the controversy over the American episcopate. Parliament might exercise the same power to set up bishops in America. Adams, *Works*, X. 188.

<sup>93</sup> *New York Hist. Soc. Coll.* (1886), *The Deane Papers*, I. 4.

<sup>94</sup> *American Archives*, fourth series, I. 959; fifth series, II. 1048.

<sup>95</sup> *Ibid.*, II. 98 (March, 1775).

<sup>96</sup> *Ibid.*, I. 777, 902, 1315. Cumberland County, Massachusetts, took the same ground. *Ibid.*, p. 801.

<sup>97</sup> John Jay, *Correspondence*, I. 27; *American Archives*, fourth series, I. 912, 920, 927.

<sup>98</sup> *American Archives*, fourth series, I. 930; V. 411, 412.

Even while the commissioners of Congress were soliciting the friendship of the people of Canada, Washington was obliged to issue an order to the Continental troops against the "ridiculous and childish custom of burning the effigy of the Pope".<sup>99</sup> The general liberalizing influences of the Revolutionary period, the French alliance, and the fact that many American Catholics embraced the Patriot cause, brought about a much more tolerant attitude in America toward the Roman faith, but we have dealt here with the effects of the prevailing intolerance at the beginning of the war.

The Whig leaders not only made use of such religious fanaticism as they found suited to their purposes, but they were obliged to combat certain religious prejudices which were restraining men from open rebellion. All Episcopalians were by the rubrical formula concerning the "Most Gracious Sovereign Lord King George, and the Royal Family", duly and piously impressed with the divine right of the king and the sanctity of his royal prerogative.<sup>100</sup> Many of other denominations, who had faith as a grain of mustard seed, were made slow to wrath against King George because they were worried over certain Scriptural passages which were dinned in their ears by the loyal defenders of the crown. "Thou shalt not revile the gods, nor curse the ruler of thy people", was a solemn warning to many, as was "Curse not the king, no, not in thy thought". They remembered, too, that "the king's wrath is as the roaring of a lion", and they wished rather his favor which "is as dew upon the grass". The "divine right" theory of government was simple and easier to understand than some more democratic doctrines. "I am bound by God's law to honor the King" was the quiet faith of many Loyalists.<sup>101</sup>

We have already seen how the Puritan preachers uttered their holy breathings against the doctrine of submission and non-resistance, but in those early arguments the quibble was made that an oppressive ruler was a tyrant, and not a king. They had not met squarely the question of kingship as a form of government. When all the logic of events (1775-1776) betrayed a drift toward independence, and actual denial of the king himself, many halted and drew back. The "divine right" reasoning had to be met. Jefferson in his *Summary View* (1774) had called the king's attention to the fact that he was "no more than the chief officer of the people, appointed by the laws . . . to assist in working the great machine

<sup>99</sup> Sparks, *Washington*, III. 144.

<sup>100</sup> AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, IV. 277.

<sup>101</sup> *American Archives*, fifth series, II. 985; Tyler, *Literary History of the American Revolution*, I. 323-324; Merriam, *American Political Theories*, p. 66; *American Archives*, fourth series, II. 132; V. 839, 850.

of government, erected for their use". There was no "divine right" admitted there. Samuel Langdon attacked it openly in his famous election sermon (1775). "Let them", said he, "who cry up the divine right of kings consider that the only form of government which had a proper claim to a divine establishment was so far from including the idea of a king, that it was a high crime for Israel to ask to be in this respect like other nations."<sup>102</sup> But it was Thomas Paine—one at least in the odor of sanctity, for he had preached without taking orders—who made the most effective attack upon the divine-right dogma. "Government by kings was first introduced into the world by the Heathen", he wrote, "which the will of the Almighty . . . expressly disapproves." As to their hereditary descent, how absurd! We do not attempt to establish an hereditary wise man, or an hereditary mathematician, or an hereditary poet. A good king is a miracle, he declared, and the history of kings is only the history of the folly and depravity of human nature. Monarchy, he wrote, subtly appealing to the American aversion to Catholicism, is the popery of government.<sup>103</sup> George III. was a frantic potentate in breeches, a brutish tyrant. In general, kings were chosen because of a ruffianly pre-eminence. "Sceptred savage", "royal brute", "breathing automaton", were the rhetorical missiles with which Paine broke in pieces the idol of the king-worshippers.<sup>104</sup> After Paine's sophisms, and "keen attempts upon the passions", as John Adams found them, there was little recurrence to the "divine right" argument except by out-and-out Loyalists.<sup>105</sup>

We have thus far barely spoken of the opposition to all this pious sedition. The Episcopalian ministry did not meanwhile sit with bridled tongue, mute and unprotesting. But in the North they preached to a small minority of people, while in the South, especially in Virginia, they were in bad repute, and had, moreover, little influence over their congregations, made up of a planter aristocracy<sup>106</sup>

<sup>102</sup> Jefferson, *Writings* (Ford ed.), I. 429; Thornton, *Pulpit of the Revolution*, p. 239. For contemporary attacks, see *American Archives*, fourth series, II. 58; III. 1106. Here again the latter-day Puritans had only to develop the ideas of their ancestors of 150 years earlier. Milton mourned that Englishmen should "fall back or rather creep back . . . to their once abjured and detested thralldom of kingship". He asked, "Where is this goodly Tower of a Commonwealth, which the English boasted they would build to overshadow Kings?" Masson, *Life of Milton*, V. 647.

<sup>103</sup> *American Archives*, fourth series, IV. 1544-1548.

<sup>104</sup> Paine, *Common Sense*. See "Cato" on this subject, *American Archives*, fourth series, V. 545, 546.

<sup>105</sup> *American Archives*, fifth series, II. 939.

<sup>106</sup> I hope in a future study of the great sectarian conflict going on before and during the war, to take up this whole problem in a more satisfactory manner.

which took its religion not over seriously. Besides, the Scotch-Irish Presbyterian preachers of the southern uplands were spreading in that region the same anti-monarchical doctrines as those we have noted, for the most part, in New England.<sup>107</sup> There were dissenting clergy, it must be admitted, who did not join with their brethren in teaching liberal political doctrines, or, later, in urging their flocks to open resistance to England, but they were in a small minority and had little effect in staying the tide of rebellion.

In view of all the facts that have here been presented, I believe that we must hereafter give more weight to the religious factor among the causes of the American Revolution. After twelve years' study of the period, I am not convinced that the economic causes of which so much has been made are adequate alone to explain the bitterness of the controversy. In fact, the whole colonial period must be studied, and many conditions noted, which there is no time to mention here, before one may at all comprehend why the American people rebelled in 1775. Among the many causes, I rate religious bigotry, sectarian antipathy, and the influence of the Calvinistic clergy, which we have reviewed, as among the most important. One may argue that after all the clergy were merely a part of the American people, affected by the same conditions, and driven in their political actions by the same motives as the members of their congregations, and that, therefore, their teachings merely reflect the general views of the times, and are not to be taken as causes, but I am convinced that they have deeper significance than that. Conflicting political ideas, and not tea or taxes, caused the American secession from the British empire, and the Puritan clergy had a large part in planting the predominant American political ideas which were antagonistic to those dominant in England. As has been said, the Americans were not only Protestants, but protestants from Protestantism itself, and from this fact, as Burke expressed it, a fierce spirit of liberty had grown up. This spirit the dissenting clergy communicated to a people far more influenced by what they heard in the House of God than we in these degenerate days can comprehend.

C. H. VAN TYNE.

<sup>107</sup> See Grigsby's article in *Washington and Lee Historical Papers*, no. 2, pp. 6 et seq.

## CAPTURED AND ABANDONED PROPERTY DURING THE CIVIL WAR

THE Civil War affords many instances of the use of extreme methods in crippling an enemy. On both sides the methods of conducting the war were of questionable reputableness, and this was true not only in unauthorized orders and in breaches of discipline, but in many measures which received the full sanction of government. The humanizing effect of modern international law has been nowhere more strikingly revealed than in the guarantees which have been introduced for the security of the lives and property of non-combatants, and the principle of the inviolability of private property on land has been thoroughly established. Yet the thoughtless repetition of "Marching through Georgia" is but a glorification over the harshness of Sherman's most famous campaign, and the failure of this sort of warfare to produce a sentiment of condemnation is but an evidence of callousness due to the frequency of such outrages. The use of explosive and poisoned bullets and chain-balls, the practice of bushwhacking, the confiscation of debts, the cruel treatment of prisoners, and the failure to exempt medicines from contraband restrictions are practices of the time which are now generally condemned, and would be avoided by civilized nations.

In this category we should now place the measures by which each belligerent dealt with the property of its enemy. The confiscation acts of the Union government<sup>1</sup> providing for the judicial seizure of "rebel" property in federal courts formed only an ineffective part of a larger policy of virtual confiscation which contemplated the employment of an elaborate machinery for appropriating the goods of the enemy. The confiscation acts involved the prosecution of suits in federal courts, and this was obviously impossible in insurrectionary districts where no such courts were in operation and where peaceful judicial process was impracticable, even though the Union forces might be in occupation of the territory. It was to be expected, however, that as the federal armies advanced they would make captures of large amounts of private property, especially cotton, and that there would be left in their train estates and miscellaneous property which had been abandoned by the owners. Much of this property would necessarily be

<sup>1</sup> AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW, XVIII. 79-96.

of such a nature that the military authorities could not dispose of it, and unless some action were taken it would be left without ownership. It was also thought desirable to encourage the capture of some of the staple products of the South, not for direct military use, but as a means of reducing the enemy's resources, and adding to the resources of the Union government.

To meet this situation Congress passed, March 12, 1863, the act relating to "captured and abandoned property".<sup>2</sup> Under this law the Secretary of the Treasury was to appoint special agents to collect property of this kind in the insurrectionary territory. The agents were to have nothing to do with property used for waging war, such as arms, ordnance, ships, etc., nor were they to have any authority over maritime prizes. The property thus collected was either to be devoted to public use on due appraisement and certificate, or to be forwarded to some place of sale in a loyal state and the proceeds turned into the treasury. Provision was also made in the law for restoration to loyal owners after the war.

This act of Congress was essentially an exercise of the belligerent right of confiscation, in a form different from that of the confiscation acts, and applying to property which the latter could not reach. Congress was competent, according to later decisions of the Supreme Court, to provide for the forfeiture of the property of *all persons* within the Confederacy, loyal as well as disloyal, on the principle that all inhabitants of enemy territory are enemies.<sup>3</sup> This however would have been an extreme measure, and the restoration of the property of loyal citizens was therefore provided for, but in doing so Congress was renouncing a part of its strict belligerent rights as the Supreme Court understood them.<sup>4</sup>

The Treasury Department proceeded vigorously in carrying out the provisions of this law,<sup>5</sup> and soon developed an elaborate administrative machinery for collecting and marketing captured property. A general agent was given charge of the whole work, under whom

<sup>2</sup> *Statutes at Large*, XII. 820. According to an opinion submitted to the Treasury Department by Attorney-General Speed, July 5, 1865, property hostilely seized by the military authorities on land was to be regarded as "captured", while the term "abandoned" was held to apply to property "whose owner shall be voluntarily absent therefrom, and engaged either in, or otherwise aiding or encouraging the rebellion". *Sen. Ex. Doc. No. 22*, 40 Cong., 2 sess.; *U. S. v. Padelford*, 9 Wallace 531.

<sup>3</sup> *Young v. U. S.*, 97 U. S. 39, 60; *U. S. v. Winchester*, 99 U. S. 372 ff., especially 375.

<sup>4</sup> *Briggs v. U. S.*, 143 U. S. 346 ff., especially 356.

<sup>5</sup> Secretary Fessenden's circular of instructions concerning commercial intercourse, and captured and abandoned property, July 29, 1864. The first stages of the work of enforcing the Captured Property Act are discussed in *Finance Report*, 1863, pp. 23-24.

was placed a large corps of "supervising agents" and "local agents", who were in turn assisted by "agency aids", and customs officers specially designated for this work by the Secretary of the Treasury.

This army of treasury officials which was thus set upon the trail of captured property in the South did not find its chase a holiday pastime.<sup>6</sup> Even though within the Union lines, they found that they were in the enemy's country, and that the inhabitants had either deserted or were hostile to the removal of property. Cases of personal injury to the officials were frequent enough to render the work highly dangerous. Marks and other evidences of the character and ownership of the cotton were often destroyed, and cotton was often hauled to the woods or swamps and concealed in advance of the agent's arrival, or, in cases where this was impossible, it was frequently burned. Agents of the Confederate government were at the same time abroad through the South collecting cotton, and this complicated the work of the Union officials, while it increased the tendency to evasion on the part of private owners.<sup>7</sup> Naturally much of the cotton so collected was in unfit condition, and needed overhauling and rebaling before being placed on the market. Above this difficulty, there still remained the danger of secret raids upon the government depots, resulting in the theft or destruction of the cotton, or perhaps the substitution of an inferior grade for that contained in the government store. Sales were required to be conducted in the loyal states, but a serious obstacle to this plan was the lack of sufficient means of transportation. Naturally the chief concern of the quartermasters in the field was the forwarding of supplies to the army, and they showed little zeal in co-operating with the treasury agents for the removal of captured property.

<sup>6</sup> A general description of the methods used in collecting captured property is to be found in Secretary McCulloch's report, November 8, 1866, *House Ex. Doc. No. 97*, 39 Cong., 2 sess. To secure unpublished material concerning the operations of the treasury officials, search has been made in the files of the Miscellaneous Division of the Treasury Department, where the records concerning captured property are deposited. Here much testimony, more or less reliable, is to be found in the form of affidavits, financial certificates, and official reports. This material is the chief source of the data upon which this article is based.

<sup>7</sup> It is well known that considerable cotton was burned by the Confederate authorities to prevent it from falling into the hands of the Union government. Among the Confederate cotton records, in charge of the Miscellaneous Division of the Treasury Department, is a book containing the names of persons who had made claims on the Confederate treasury for cotton destroyed by their own forces, among whom was President Jefferson Davis, who made claim for 200 bales burned. The following are published documents dealing with this general subject: Report of A. Roane, Chief of Confederate Produce Loan Office, *House Misc. Doc. No. 190*, 44 Cong., 1 sess., p. 39; Report of DeBow, general Confederate cotton agent, *ibid.*; *Treas. Dept. Circular*, no. 4, January 9, 1900. See also account of the facts in Mrs. Alexander's Cotton, 2 Wallace 405.



Because of the perilous character of this work of bringing in property from the insurrectionary districts, the government offered large inducements to private individuals who would undergo the necessary risks. Treasury officials offered to pay twenty-five per cent. of the proceeds to any who would bale up and bring in cotton and deliver it to the agent at one of the shipping ports. This form of contract did not authorize purchases within the Confederate lines.<sup>8</sup> A peculiar kind of executive permit, however, was issued by President Lincoln which authorized the holder, even over the protest of the military authorities, to pass through the lines and seize property in the insurrectionary districts, the licensee being allowed to keep three-fourths of the proceeds.<sup>9</sup> After Lincoln's death, some of the licensees were deprived of the property, and the proceeds were put into the treasury. The Supreme Court decided that the President had no power to make these contracts, since they were in violation of the non-intercourse acts.<sup>10</sup> Wherever purchases were made beyond the lines of military occupation of the federal forces they were outlawed. Later, however, Congress by a special act came to the relief of claimants who were thus dispossessed.

As might be expected, this system of collecting property produced many irregularities and cases of fraud. Individuals under contract to collect and deliver cotton to a Union agent would often seize property which they had no right to touch, or would collect heavy bales of good quality and turn over to the government light bales of poor quality. Residents in some cases represented themselves as agents for the Union government, and simply robbed under this pretended authority, not condescending to show by what right they made their seizures. Agents themselves blundered at times because of a misunderstanding of their duties, or committed outrages in deliberate dishonesty. The unscrupulous agent, of course, had exceptional opportunities for gain. In the process of repacking, large quantities of cotton might be abstracted and disposed of at private sale. False reports might be submitted, concealing the true amount received. Immediate supervision might be evaded by the pretext of direct orders from Washington to dispose of the cotton in some other way than through the office of the next superior agent. In certain districts, military authorities were implicated in defrauding the government, and in such a situation lawless bands of thieves were encouraged while good citizens were intimidated.

<sup>8</sup> *House Ex. Doc. No. 97*, 39 Cong., 2 sess., p. 3; *U. S. v. Lane*, 8 Wallace 185.

<sup>9</sup> Report of House Committee on Judiciary, *House Report No. 83*, 45 Cong., 3 sess. In the case of *U. S. v. 129 Packages*, 27 Fed. Cas. 284, such a permit was used fraudulently to ship whiskey into a Union camp.

<sup>10</sup> *Ouachita Cotton Case*, 6 Wallace 521; *McKee v. U. S.*, 8 Wallace 163.

Considering these difficulties, the Captured Property Act was extensively enforced. As reported officially in May, 1868, the gross proceeds from the sale of cotton were \$29,518,041, and the gross proceeds from miscellaneous property \$1,309,650. The net total derived from captured and abandoned property was \$25,257,931.<sup>11</sup>

It will be seen that over ninety-five per cent. of the property handled by the treasury agents was cotton. It is not hard to understand why this important commodity was so eagerly sought by the Union authorities. Being the greatest staple product of the South, it was regarded as their most valuable source of wealth, and was held to contribute so directly to the support of the Rebellion that it should not be regarded in the same light as ordinary private property. It was declared by the Supreme Court to be a proper subject for capture by the Union authorities during the Civil War, and not to be protected by the general rule of international law which condemns the seizure of private property on land.<sup>12</sup>

The control of deserted houses and plantations was one of the important problems involved in the execution of the Captured Property Act. Property whose owner was absent in aid of the insurrection was legally regarded as abandoned, and was given over to the jurisdiction of the Treasury Department.<sup>13</sup> No attempt was made to disturb the title to this deserted property, some of which, in spite of the legal definition, was understood to belong to loyal owners; it was merely held under the temporary control of the Union officials, ready to be returned to its owners after the war in the event of their loyalty being proved, or to be confiscated if owned by a "rebel". The property was ordinarily put in the hands of tenants who engaged to cultivate it, but in some cases, especially in towns, it was appropriated to the relief of needy applicants who could show both poverty and loyalty.

The machinery for administering these abandoned estates, as illustrated by the case of Louisiana,<sup>14</sup> involved a plantation bureau at New Orleans, in charge of a "superintendent of plantations"

<sup>11</sup> *Sen. Ex. Doc. No. 56*, 40 Cong., 2 sess., p. 52.

<sup>12</sup> *Mrs. Alexander's Cotton*, 2 Wallace 404; *Briggs v. U. S.*, 143 U. S. 346, 357; *Whitfield v. U. S.*, 92 U. S. 165, 170. In the last case the court declared that cotton was "during the late war, as much hostile property as the military supplies and munitions it was used to obtain".

<sup>13</sup> *Stat. at Large*, XII. 820, sec. 1; XIII. 375, 376.

<sup>14</sup> The records of these transactions are deposited in the archives of the Treasury Department at Washington, in charge of the Miscellaneous Division. The following titles will indicate the nature of this unpublished material: List of Plantations transferred to the Treasury Department, 3d. agency, by S. B. Holabird, Col. and Chief Quartermaster, Dept. of Gulf, October 1, 1863; Plantation Inventories, bk. no. 74; Plantation Bureau Records, containing inspectors' reports, bk. no. 72.

under whom was placed a corps of agents and inspectors whose function it was to keep the central office in touch with the large number of lessees and occupants to whom the estates were leased or granted. The rents and proceeds derived from this period of temporary control were appropriated by the government, and turned in as a part of the captured and abandoned property "fund".

The disturbance of the ordinary conditions of life which is incidental to warfare was nowhere more in evidence than in connection with this system of operating deserted plantations. Neglect of improvements, dilapidation of buildings, and deterioration due to inexperienced farming were everywhere apparent. The lessee's interest naturally extended only to the harvesting of the immediate crop, and this object was furthered in disregard of the permanent up-keep of the property. Several plantations might at times be under the control of one individual or firm and this led to the transfer and indiscriminate mixture of movable property which should have been localized in particular estates. The negroes, suddenly shifted to a free status and to a system of lax discipline, became unruly and faithless to contract. Offers of higher wages or easier work would readily seduce them from one plantation to another and such a departure of laborers might occasion the loss of a whole crop. Trouble arose also because of the "hands" claiming the right to plant cotton or anything else in their respective patches regardless of the requirements of the overseer. All of these difficulties of management were enhanced by the military authorities, who caused constant annoyance by deporting mules without compensation, issuing full rations to idle negroes, and enrolling the "hands" as "contraband troops". It sometimes happened that a plantation might be occupied for months as a camp or a recruiting station, making successful cultivation impossible.

It is clear that this whole system, in its essential features, amounted to temporary confiscation. The government based its claim to the proceeds of "captured" property and the revenue from deserted property, during the period of its abandonment, upon the owner's disloyalty. In the measures adopted after the war, however, the hardships caused by confiscation in its various forms were considerably mitigated, and this was especially true of the seizures made under the Captured Property Act. Seizure in these cases did not involve final condemnation, since the statute itself contemplated relief to all "loyal" claimants who would, within two years after the close of the war, prove their right before the Court of Claims. In addition, the executive policy of unconditional pardon and general amnesty, adopted after the war, removed finally all distinction

between "loyal" and "disloyal" owners, and required the restoration, so far as practicable, of all forfeited property rights.<sup>15</sup>

In treating the question of restorations as affecting captured and abandoned property certain incidental methods will be briefly examined, and then the work of the Court of Claims will be somewhat

<sup>15</sup> It will perhaps be in order to give at this point a brief explanation of the effect of pardon upon confiscated property. The first pardon proclamation of President Lincoln, and the first three of President Johnson, contained various exceptions and conditions, among which were provisions that confiscated property should not be returned. Finally, a proclamation of December 25, 1868, declared an unconditional pardon without the requirement of an oath, and without reservations as to forfeited property rights. So far as executive policy is concerned, however, there seems to have been no very definite programme touching the effect of pardon upon proceedings and judgments under the confiscation acts. Attorney-General Speed's first official utterance on the subject, issued in the form of instructions to district attorneys in May, 1865, directed the discontinuance of confiscation proceedings, but these orders were later revoked, and district attorneys were directed to press cases forward to an early determination. In the order of President Johnson regarding the re-establishment of the authority of the United States in Virginia after the close of the war, we find the following: "The Attorney-General will instruct the proper officials to libel and bring to judgment, confiscation, and sale property subject to confiscation, and enforce the administration of justice within said state." In accordance with this order, Speed directed District Attorney Chandler to see that the appropriate officials were instructed to perform their duties as the President directed. (Letter Books of the Department of Justice, 1865 and 1866; Exec. Order, May 9, 1865, *Offic. Rec.*, third series, V. 14.) The problem was ultimately disposed of by the Supreme Court in a series of decisions. As regards the first confiscation act the question was decided in 1867 in the case of *Armstrong's Foundry*, 6 Wallace 766, where the court held that the statute regarded the owner's consent to the hostile use of the property as an offense of which confiscation was the penalty; hence pardon would restore to the claimant that portion of the proceeds which went to the government, no opinion being expressed as to the informer's share. A different and somewhat confusing line of interpretation was followed in the case of the act of 1862, for here the court declared that not even universal amnesty could restore the lost property rights. The court argued that the second confiscation act was passed in exercise of belligerent rights, not for the punishment of treason, hence pardon of the traitor could not relieve him of the forfeiture. It was further maintained that property which had been sold to a purchaser in good faith and for value could not be interfered with, and that the proceeds deposited in the treasury were beyond the reach of judicial action, since Congress alone has power to reappropriate money once covered into the treasury. (*Semmes v. U. S.*, 91 U. S. 21, 27; *Knote v. U. S.*, 95 U. S. 149.) The judicial interpretation of the two acts is, in fact, somewhat puzzling, and it does not appear that any broad underlying principles were consistently adhered to. In the case of the act of 1861 the whole title in fee was held to be surrendered on the ground that the proceeding was merely against the property, but the pardoned owner was as we have just seen entitled to that share of the proceeds which went to the government. In seizures under the act of 1862 the life interest only was forfeited, thus at least partly recognizing the confiscation as a penalty for a criminal offense, but no recovery could be secured by reason of pardon. Moreover, in the very brief opinion in the case of *Armstrong's Foundry* nothing is said about the exclusive right of Congress to control the appropriation of money from the treasury, though in the case of *Knote v. United States* this was made one of the chief grounds for refusing restoration.

more fully considered. Both during and after the war we find that direct methods of release were followed which disregarded, in some measure, the statutory jurisdiction of the Court of Claims over these cases. Quartermasters at times released property, secured by military seizure, before it had passed to the treasury officials. The Secretary of the Treasury, who was continually beset with appeals concerning erroneous seizures, exercised regularly during the war the judicial function of allowing releases if convinced of the good faith of the applicants.<sup>16</sup> This policy he continued for some months after the war, until, by an opinion of the Attorney-General, these cases were all referred to the Court of Claims.

Another important agency concerned in the restoration of property was the Bureau of Refugees, Freedmen, and Abandoned Lands. This institution was created by Congress, March 3, 1865, to provide protection and support for emancipated negroes, and to it control of confiscated, captured, and abandoned real property was entrusted.<sup>17</sup> Estates which had been administered on a lease system by treasury agents were placed in charge of the bureau, as was also property seized for judicial confiscation but not actually condemned, and a miscellaneous class of property in the hands of military authorities at the close of the war. The original intention was that deserted lands should be allotted in small holdings to individual freedmen, and, in South Carolina and Georgia, some land was actually assigned. In general, however, the bureau either used its land for colonies of freedmen, or continued the lease system in order to make its property productive of revenue.

At first the bureau adopted a cautious policy regarding restorations, and declined all applications not supported by proof of past as well as present loyalty. By President Johnson's order in August, 1865, however, the bureau was instructed to return the property of all who were included in the partial amnesty proclamations of that year, or who, if excluded from these proclamations, could show certificates of special pardon. As a result of these instructions, the bureau was compelled to part with the greater portion of the property once under its control, and the plan of allotment to freedmen was defeated because of the uncertainty of tenure applying to the bureau's holdings. A report of Commissioner Howard shows that the officers of the bureau restored 15,452 acres of land seized under the second confiscation act, 14,652 acres received as aban-

<sup>16</sup> The actual adjudication of these claims rested, in fact, with the local agent; that is, he would send in the papers with his recommendation for the secretary's action. Report of Secretary McCulloch, *Sen. Ex. Doc. No. 22*, 40 Cong., 2 sess.

<sup>17</sup> *Stat. at Large*, XIII. 507.

doned and allotted to freedmen, and 400,000 acres of abandoned property which had never been allotted. Thus the total restorations amounted to 430,104 acres.<sup>18</sup>

It should be remembered, however, that the restorations made by the Treasury Department, by the military authorities, and by the Freedmen's Bureau were but incidental, since the Court of Claims was the regularly designated tribunal for adjudicating these cases, and was the only agency by which the grounds of release were subjected to a strictly judicial determination. In dealing with these cases the Court of Claims followed, not too rigidly, the terms of the various statutes involved,<sup>19</sup> and introduced certain rules of its own making. The claimant was required to show that he was the owner of the property claimed and that he had never given aid or comfort to the Rebellion. The government was not to be loaded with the burden of proving disloyalty. Voluntary residence in an insurrectionary district was taken as *prima facie* evidence of a rebellious character, and this must be rebutted by satisfactory testimony covering the whole period of the war, and showing that no act of sympathy to the Confederate movement had been willingly performed.

The Court of Claims thus became the tribunal for judging the facts as to the conduct of thousands of professed Unionists in the South, and its hearings assumed somewhat the character of a judgment-day proceeding, where, after the deeds of all had been laid

<sup>18</sup> After President Johnson's order, the rules followed by the bureau in connection with these restorations were that land should not be regarded as confiscated until condemned and sold by a federal court; that property not properly considered abandoned or confiscated should be surrendered to claimants; that property be restored to pardoned "rebels", and that restoration of land under cultivation be conditioned upon the payment by the claimant of an amount sufficient to compensate loyal refugees for their labor in working the lands. For the action of the Freedmen's Bureau regarding property see: General Order War Dept. no. 110, *Offic. Rec.*, third series, V. 51; Reports of General O. O. Howard, Commissioner, *House Ex. Doc. No. 11*, 39 Cong., 1 sess.; *House Misc. Doc. No. 78*, 38 Cong., 1 sess.; *House Ex. Doc. No. 19*, 39 Cong., 1 sess.; *ibid.*, No. 99; Peirce, *The Freedmen's Bureau* (University of Iowa Studies, vol. III., no. 1), pp. 21, 22, 24.

<sup>19</sup> The following provision for the reclamation of property was included in the Captured and Abandoned Property Act: "Any person claiming to have been the owner of any such abandoned or captured property may, at any time within two years after the suppression of the rebellion, prefer his claim to the proceeds thereof in the court of claims; and on proof to the satisfaction of said court of his ownership of said property, of his right to the proceeds thereof, and that he has never given any aid or comfort to the present rebellion, to receive the residue of such proceeds, after the deduction of any purchase-money which may have been paid, together with the expense of transportation and sale of said property, and any other lawful expenses attending the disposition thereof." *Stat. at Large*, XII. 820, sec. 3. By a further enactment of July 27, 1868, the remedy thus given was declared to be exclusive, precluding the claimant from "suit at common law, or any other mode of redress whatever". *Ibid.*, XV. 244, sec. 3.



bare, the faithful were rewarded and the rebellious turned away. The voluminous testimony which the court examined constitutes perhaps the best body of material revealing in detail the conduct of "loyal" Southerners, and for the historian who takes up the study of the Civil War loyalists it will have somewhat the same value as the papers of the New York Royal Commission had for the study of the corresponding topic in the Revolutionary War.<sup>20</sup>

Men and women of Union sympathies, as this testimony shows, were scattered in considerable number throughout the South. Surrounded as they were by a repressing and persecuting majority, they naturally found it difficult to express their loyalty in any active, organized form. They had to be content, therefore, with a negative attitude, a sort of "passive resistance", refusing to take any voluntary measures against the government at Washington, and performing individual acts of friendship to the Union cause. We find them resisting the Confederate draft, carrying provisions and medicine to the Union soldiers, contributing funds for helping the "blue-coats", attending the boys in the hospitals, and in other equally mild ways promoting the Union cause.

This "loyalty", which meant simply treason from the standpoint of Southern communities and neighborhoods, naturally incurred local persecution, and the Unionist of the South moved constantly in an atmosphere of scorn and prejudice, and was continually disturbed by threats of personal violence. Furthermore, he was often compelled against his will to give some support to the Southern cause. It was an exceptional Unionist indeed who was not pressed into the conscript lines, or compelled to subscribe to a Confederate loan, or forced to labor on entrenchments, and in addition to all this he must of course pay taxes into the "rebel" treasury, however loud might be his protest. Children even caught up the national feud, and the refusal of one daring youth to give up the Stars and Stripes for the neighbor boys to spit upon resulted in a severe laceration, and later in a fatal blow from a brickbat.

In conducting these suits, the Court of Claims found its docket well crowded. The total amount paid out in judgments in such cases up to February 4, 1888, was reported as \$9,864,300.75.<sup>21</sup> When we remember that the sums involved in each case were usually small, and that these figures represent only the claims which were

<sup>20</sup> Testimony of the sort here referred to may be found in the following published reports of cases, *Court of Claims Reports*, III. 119, 177, 218, 240, 390; IV. 337; V. 412, 586, 706.

<sup>21</sup> *Treas. Dept. Circular*, no. 4, January 9, 1900. For a list of judgments rendered between March, 1863, and March, 1867, see, *House Misc. Doc. No. 50*, 40 Cong., 1 sess., pp. 2-9.



allowed, we can form an idea of the vast amount of this litigation which the court handled.

The most critical point of law touching these claims related to the effect of the pardon and amnesty action of the President upon the rights of claimants for property seized during the war. Were disloyal owners permanently divested of their property by that proviso of the Captured Property Act which required proof that the owner had "never given any aid or comfort to the present rebellion", or could the consequences of disloyalty be avoided by the President's proclamation of pardon and amnesty, and the owner's acceptance of the oath of allegiance? This question was presented in the case of *United States v. Klein*, appealed from the Court of Claims to the Supreme Court.<sup>22</sup> The most liberal view of the case was sustained by the latter tribunal. In substance the opinion was that Congress had intended to restore property not only to loyal owners, but to those who had been hostile and should later become loyal, that after the proclamation of general amnesty the restoration of property to all *bona fide* owners claiming under the Captured Property Act became the duty of the government, and that such restoration became the "absolute right of the persons pardoned", the government having constituted itself the trustee, not only for claimants protected by the original act, but for all who might later be recognized as entitled to their property. "'Pardon and restoration of political rights'", declared the court, "were in return for the oath and its fulfillment. To refuse it would be a breach of faith not less 'cruel and astounding' than to abandon the freed people whom the Executive had promised to maintain in their freedom."

After this decision of the Supreme Court, therefore, all claimants who had been dispossessed through the operation of the Captured Property Act were, regardless of loyalty, entitled to restoration. There was, however, another proviso in the original act which more seriously affected the claimants' prospects of recovery. The suits must, according to the law, be brought within two years "after the suppression of the rebellion". The claim, for instance, in the case of *United States v. Anderson* was preferred June 5, 1868.<sup>23</sup> Could this be construed as having been presented within the prescribed limit? Here the court was called upon to fix the exact date when, in the strict legal sense, the Rebellion ceased. Again a liberal construction was adopted. The court held that Congress could not be

<sup>22</sup> 13 Wallace 128, 142. The decision in *U. S. v. Padelford*, 9 Wallace 531, is similar.

<sup>23</sup> 9 Wallace 56.

supposed to have left possible claimants to decide this matter for themselves, and that, in lieu of a formal treaty of peace, which in the case of a foreign war serves to mark the exact point at which the legal relations peculiar to war cease, there must be some public act or legislation which will serve to fix definitely such a point. The date of President Johnson's proclamation, August 20, 1866, in which for the first time the entire suppression of the Rebellion throughout the country was declared, was taken by the court as marking the legal termination of the war. It was pointed out that on March 2, 1867, Congress, referring to an act of June 20, 1864, regarding the pay of non-commissioned officers and privates, had continued the act in force for three years "from and after the close of the rebellion, as announced by the proclamation of the President, August 20, 1866". This date had therefore been declared by the executive and legislative departments to be the termination of the Rebellion, and the court declared that it must therefore be so applied with reference to the rights intended to be secured by the Captured Property Act.

Unfortunately for the claimants, the decision in the Klein case did not come until 1869, after the period had expired during which, according to the declaration of the Supreme Court in the Anderson case, the recovery of property was possible. It thus appeared that there were many claimants to whom, as a matter of equity, Congress owed relief, while at the same time it was alleged that a considerable sum, variously reported but supposed to be well over ten million dollars, remained as a part of the captured property or cotton "fund" after the necessary deductions were made. For this reason agitation was begun to secure relief for those claimants who, under the very natural misapprehension that they would be required to prove loyalty, had allowed the two years' limitation to lapse without taking advantage of their right to plead before the Court of Claims. Various bills to revive in favor of such claimants the right of action before the Court of Claims have been presented to Congress, and the House Committee on the Judiciary has at various times reported favorably on such legislation, but no action has yet been taken.<sup>24</sup> Meanwhile curious suggestions have been made regarding the disposition of this "fund", such as dividing it among the states or devoting it to the relief of ex-Confederate soldiers, but these proposals, like the proposed bills and committee reports, have been lost in the general oblivion of the Congressional calendar.

<sup>24</sup> *Cong. Globe*, 52 Cong., 1 sess., House Bills 173, 455, 2764, 5451; *ibid.*, vol. 28, House Bill 7618; *House Report No. 646*, 50 Cong., 1 sess.; *ibid.*, No. 784, 51 Cong., 1 sess.; *ibid.*, No. 1377, 52 Cong., 1 sess.

In general the various reports and proposals presented on this complicated subject are inconsistent. The number of claimants whose right of action was debarred has doubtless been greatly exaggerated, while a careful analysis shows that the figures and assertions regarding the so-called "fund" in the treasury are misleading. In the report of the House Committee on the Judiciary, submitted to the first session of the Fifty-Second Congress, we find a statistical exhibit which shows \$31,722,466.20 as the "whole amount of abandoned and captured property sales", and after the deduction of such items as cost of collecting, amounts transferred or released, or amounts paid out of the "fund" on judgments or special acts of release, a balance of \$10,512,007.96 is shown as the amount remaining from the captured property "fund".<sup>25</sup>

By reference, however, to the report of the Register of the Treasury, February 4, 1888, it appears that the *net* receipts from captured and abandoned property were \$26,887,584.39. Not all of this, however, was secured from the sale of privately owned cotton.<sup>26</sup> A sum exceeding six million dollars included under this heading was derived from the *purchase* of cotton by the treasury officials, the cotton later being sold for gold, thus involving a double profit owing to the premium on gold. Receipts from miscellaneous property, from rents, and from the sale of captured vessels were also classed in this same fund. A deduction of these various items leaves \$15,880,664.19, as the receipts from the sale of individual cotton.

One very important item in this last total, however, was a sum amounting to \$4,886,671 received from the sale of cotton captured after June 30, 1865, nearly all of which was Confederate, not private, cotton. To understand the nature of this item it must be explained that seizures under the Captured and Abandoned Property Act did not cease at the close of the war. Besides the collection of private property the treasury officials had been constantly active in seizing the property of the Confederate government.<sup>27</sup> Much of this property was in the hands of private holders scattered throughout the insurrectionary states, and the treasury agents continued their collections of this sort of property during 1865. After the spring of 1865 the seizures of the Treasury Department were chiefly confined to property which had been sold to the Confederate government, or to one of the Confederate states, or subscribed to the "produce loan" of the Confederacy, or delivered as military supplies to the Confederate army.

In collecting this property of the Confederate government, much

<sup>25</sup> *House Report No. 1377*, 52 Cong., 1 sess., p. 2.

<sup>26</sup> *Treas. Dept. Circular*, no. 4, January 9, 1900.

<sup>27</sup> *House Ex. Doc. No. 97*, 39 Cong., 2 sess.

difficulty was experienced in avoiding the seizure of purely private property. Agents would often take cotton held in private possession on suspicion that it belonged to the Confederate States. If mistakes were discovered, the property was usually released to the owner at once without requiring proofs of loyalty. Sometimes rather loose methods were used in the collection of "C. S. cotton" after the war. Mr. X would come to the agent and say, "I know where some C. S. cotton is", and the agent would engage to give him a portion if he would bring it in. X would then get any cotton he could lay his hands on and deliver it over to the agent.<sup>28</sup> In this and similar ways, there was indiscriminate seizure of private property with that which had belonged to the Confederacy, but on the whole considerable caution seems to have been exercised by the Treasury Department.<sup>29</sup> To aid them in avoiding erroneous seizure of private cotton, agents had access to lists which had been kept by "rebel" cotton agents showing where and in whose possession C. S. A. cotton was to be found. Another valuable source of evidence was to be had in the county tax lists from which all public (Confederate) cotton was excluded as not subject to taxation, and on which none but private cotton was entered.<sup>30</sup>

If now we recur to the above-mentioned fifteen millions actually received from individual cotton, and deduct the various disbursements which must be charged against this sum, such as expenses, amounts allowed by the Secretary of the Treasury on claims, amounts paid on judgments of the Court of Claims, or allowed by private acts of Congress, there remains a balance of \$4,992,349.92.<sup>31</sup> This amount, it will be noticed, is substantially equal to the proceeds of the sale of cotton which belonged to the Confederacy. Hence it is maintained by the Treasury Department that no such "fund" as that mentioned in the House Committee's report exists, and that the balance now in the treasury represents not the value of cotton due to individuals whose claims have been debarred, but the amount received from Confederate cotton which the United States is under no just or equitable obligation to return.

<sup>28</sup> In some instances of this sort as much as 75 per cent. of the proceeds was to be paid to the person undertaking the risk of collecting the cotton. The records of B. F. Flanders, supervising special agent of the Treasury Department at New Orleans, contain numerous such instances. These records are filed with the Miscellaneous Division of the Treasury Department.

<sup>29</sup> In Secretary McCulloch's printed circular of instructions, October 20, 1865, agents were warned to use great care in collecting property belonging to the Confederate government, or subscribed to the produce loan, "to the end that the rights of individuals be not interfered with, or the property of unoffending persons taken from them".

<sup>30</sup> Affidavit of William A. McCann, December 12, 1865, Cotton and Captured Property Record, no. 4027. Files of the Treasury Department.

<sup>31</sup> *Treas. Dept. Circular*, no. 4, January 9, 1900.

These war claims are still being constantly urged. When presented directly to the Court of Claims they are declared outlawed by the two-year limitation. If they appear in the form of private petitions to Congress for equitable relief, they are ultimately referred to the Treasury Department for recommendation, and the department maintains a set of clerks whose whole time is given to examining the genuineness of such claims. In this rather unsatisfactory shape the question rests to-day, with an exaggerated impression abroad as to the number of owners dispossessed, and with a misapprehension, even on the part of Congressmen, as to the existence of a "fund" for their relief.

JAMES G. RANDALL.

## THE POSITION OF AMERICAN ECONOMIC HISTORY

THE aim of this paper is first to show what ought to be the scope and purpose of economic history if it is to be pursued as a separate subject of study and then to note what progress has been made in that direction in American history. It will be convenient to begin by calling attention to the changes which have in recent years taken place in the attitude of our historians and economists toward this subject. No one who attended the meeting of the American Historical Association in Boston last winter could fail to be impressed by the interest which its members manifested in the economic side of history. Professor Turner in his presidential address two years ago called attention to its importance to all students of American history and there seemed now to be a pretty general response to his words. In striking contrast to this interest among historians was the lack of it among the members of the Economic Association. Topics in economic history found no place upon their programme. Their meetings were devoted entirely to the discussion of current problems and no one showed the slightest disposition to approach those problems from an historical point of view or to look to history for any light upon them. It was significant also that the project of the economic department of the Carnegie Institution for a co-operative economic history of the United States received no attention whatever. No inquiries were heard and no information was given to the association concerning its progress. This difference in the attitude of the two associations is, I believe, typical of the attitude of historians and economists generally in this country.

If now we turn back a period of twenty years we shall find a situation in one respect exactly the reverse of the present one. Interest in economic history was at that time scarcely less marked than it is to-day, but historians had very little share in it. It was to be found chiefly among economists and was the result of the influence among them of the so-called historical school. This influence became strong in this country during the eighties and culminated in the establishment of professorships of economic history in the departments of economics in the leading universities. Harvard established the first of them in 1891 and other institutions soon after followed her lead. Economic history was everywhere expected to play an important part in that reconstruction of economic science which was then going on. Since that period there

has come about the radical change to which we have referred. Interest in economic history among economists has steadily declined, while among historians it has as steadily increased. What are the influences which have produced these changes? An examination of them will do much to reveal the real nature of the subject and the reasons for its development.

The disposition of economists to regard economic history as of less consequence to their science is undoubtedly due to the declining influence of the historical school among them. As a separate branch of study economic history owes its existence to that school. Its early development was a part of the reaction against the classical political economy, for which that school stood. According to views of the historical school the science of economics ought to be made less abstract and deductive. It ought to take into account more of the concrete facts of economic life; and its laws and principles, if indeed there were to be any, ought to be derived from a wide survey of these facts by a process of induction. This, however, was not the chief criticism. Economic science should be dynamic rather than static. It ought to make proper allowance for change and development in economic life. No general truths concerning the production and distribution of wealth should be laid down independent of time and place. Everything must be relative to the particular stage of development which each country has reached at a given time; and the most important matters to consider are the forces which cause the changes. Economic science ought to be primarily a theory of development and not merely an explanation of the way in which human beings produce wealth and share it as income under a given set of social conditions. The great corrective to the old political economy and the chief means of building up the new was to be the thorough study of the economic life of the past.

Without attempting here any criticism of these views it will not be going too far to assert that they have ceased to have any considerable influence upon the development of economic science, and that their advocates have failed completely to reconstruct it to fit these ideas. Economic theory has indeed been pretty thoroughly overhauled and transformed during the last generation, but it has not become primarily a theory of development. Through all the transforming influences it has remained in that respect exactly what it was under the classical school—a body of generalizations concerning the way in which wealth is produced and distributed as income under a given set of social conditions; these conditions are what have come to exist in practically all civilized countries since the Industrial Revolution. Economic laws or principles as they are



now formulated relate to these conditions and to no others. Economists are not chiefly interested in inquiring how these conditions came to exist nor in discovering the forces which may be at work to fundamentally change them in the future, though owing to the influence of the socialists they do not entirely ignore this phase of the subject. As to the process by which wealth was produced and distributed in society before it assumed this modern form, it is safe to say that economists as such are not interested in that at all. Nor can the science of economics be said to be any less abstract and deductive than it used to be. The old political economy was built up from a few general truths concerning wealth, capital, human nature, and the physical world, which were derived from observation of contemporaneous conditions. The new economics of our day is the product of precisely the same method. The leading principles are not drawn from any wide survey of economic conditions in the past, but are obtained directly from the observation and analysis of what goes on about us in the business world. So far as history furnishes any of the facts upon which they are based it is very recent history—what may be called contemporary history. The chief economic writers of our day are as innocent of any thorough knowledge of history in the broad sense as ever were Ricardo and his followers. Moreover not a few of them show even less familiarity with the concrete facts of the economic life of their own time and quite as great a liking for abstract treatment of the subject.

I do not mean to hold that the historical movement among economists has been entirely fruitless. It has certainly done much to reveal the economic life of the past, and that, as we shall see presently, is a service of great value to students of social evolution; but so far as economic science is concerned it has had no important results. The body of economic history which has been produced by it stands in no vital relation to the principles of the science. It is useful and convenient as a means of illustrating some of those principles and to some slight extent in testing them; but it has not in a single instance been the means of their discovery and establishment. Its chief value to the economist is that it familiarizes him with institutions and helps him to realize the organic nature of society. Economic history stands in about the same relation to the science of economics in which political and constitutional history stand to the new science of modern government. In the last twenty-five years such a science has been created. It attempts to describe and explain the working of popular government in the leading civilized countries in the same way in which the science of economics attempts to

describe and explain the economic organization of those countries. It is more complex than economics because modern countries differ much more in their political than in their economic organization, and the science of government has to take these differences into account. But like economics it is based upon contemporaneous conditions and deals with institutions which in their present form have existed but a short time. Neither science owes much that is essential to the study of history.

The reason for this situation is not difficult to discover. In the case of economics it is due to two circumstances. In the first place it is practically impossible to gain a sufficiently detailed and accurate knowledge of the economic life of people a century or more ago to make their experience of any value in solving present problems. Men have never been accustomed to write very fully about their business affairs for publication, and such records of private business transactions as have come down to us even in American history are extremely meagre. This difficulty is not encountered to the same extent in political history, where public records and the writings of public men supply most of the information that is required. The second circumstance is however far more important. It is the fact that the Industrial Revolution has so changed economic life that even if we were able to gain sufficient knowledge of past conditions they would be of little use in helping to explain the present. Power-driven machinery, modern methods of transportation and communication, the resulting territorial division of labor with the use of large capital, and the appearance of the captain of industry, have created a new world so far as the production of wealth is concerned, and one which has only a very remote resemblance to what existed a hundred years ago. In this respect the science of government is in much the same situation. The coming of democracy represents quite as great a break in political life as the Industrial Revolution caused in economic life. In both cases history has been made a thing of minor value in explaining contemporaneous affairs. It is interesting to know how the political and economic institutions of the present time have come to be what they are, but such knowledge is by no means essential to an understanding of their working. It is equally futile to seek light upon the present problem of the protective tariff from the history of the mercantile system of the eighteenth century and to expect to learn anything about the working of modern democratic government from a study of the French monarchy and the English aristocracy of that same period.

Turn now to the historians and consider the influences which

have acted to arouse their interest in the economic side of their subject. American historians, like those of other countries, have been concerned primarily with politics, but they have always given considerable attention to economic affairs because American politics have turned so largely upon economic questions that no one could hope to understand and explain them without studying those questions. Moreover in a democracy, where the action of government is determined by the feelings and sentiments of the people, general economic conditions must profoundly influence political action. Some very good economic history is therefore to be found in the pages of our older historians like Ramsay and Hildreth. During the last fifty years, however, this connection between politics and economics in this country has become much closer. The character of the economic questions with which our government has had to deal has changed. Before the Civil War they related almost entirely to production. Should the powers of the government be used to aid production by levying protective duties, by establishing a national bank, by adopting some kind of policy of internal improvement? It was possible in all such cases to take a *laissez-faire* position and oppose government interference on the ground that private enterprise, stimulated and controlled by competition, would produce better results. There was always a strong party among the people who held this position and in most matters it was strong enough to determine the policy adopted. The economic questions which came to the front after the war were of a different kind. They related to the distribution of wealth rather than to its production. Competition as an automatic regulator of economic life was breaking down at many points. Among the laboring class it was causing long hours, low wages, and the employment of women and children. In the railroad industry it was forcing many companies into bankruptcy and compelling all to discriminate in their charges, or to form pools to control rates. In many manufacturing industries it was giving rise to trusts and combines. In the growing cities an entire group of so-called public service industries, like water-supply, gas-supply, and street-railways, was springing up in which the operation of competition was obviously impossible. In all these matters the problem was, how to protect one class from another and the general public from the rapacity of individuals. There was no possibility of a *laissez-faire* position. Competition could no longer be relied upon to enable each person to secure his fair share of the product of industry, and there was nothing left but government interference in some form or other. It has come now to be recognized on every hand that the great problem of democratic govern-

ment is, how to deal with these economic questions of distribution. Under such conditions it was obviously impossible to deal with politics without a thorough understanding of economic conditions, and our historians have been greatly influenced in recent years by this situation.

The effect of a similar situation in the world at large may be discerned. It is a familiar doctrine that every generation has to rewrite history from its own point of view. The historian's work is not simply to find out and record what has happened in the past. He must also select for treatment the events which are significant and important, and this work is no less essential than that of finding out the facts and explaining them. In it he is bound to be influenced by the spirit of his age—by the subjects which interest his generation and stir their thought and feeling. The middle portion of the nineteenth century furnishes a good example of this. After the Napoleonic wars, for fifty years or more, the people of all western Europe were engaged in the work of remodelling or entirely reconstructing their political institutions. The problems which touched them most closely and called loudest for solution were to be found in this field. Public men and all thoughtful people were eager to learn all that could be known about the political institutions of the past and the course of their development. Historians now began to give special attention to this aspect of the past and to write constitutional history. As a separate branch of historical study it had not existed before this time. The first book in English with such a title was Hallam's *Constitutional History of England*, published in 1827. The rapid development of constitutional history from about 1830 to 1880 was due to the historian's response to the spirit and needs of the time. During the last quarter of the century the situation changed. After the Franco-Prussian War the work of political reconstruction was nearly finished. The economic problems to which I have referred now came to the front in all progressive countries and absorbed more and more the attention of their people. It was inevitable that historians should be affected by this situation in exactly the same way as they had been by the earlier one. They began now to give more attention to economic affairs, and while they produced few special works on economic history much more space was given to economic matters in the general histories that were written. The tendency showed itself in such titles as Green's *History of the English People* and McMaster's *History of the People of the United States*.

There is still another factor which has had perhaps more influence than anything else in determining the attitude of historians. It

is the new conception of what history is, which they are gradually coming to hold. Freeman's idea that history is past politics, and the more modern notion of Seeley that it is the record of state-building, are being slowly relinquished in theory at least, although they still continue to determine the character of nearly all the general histories that are written. In their place has come a broader conception. It is not difficult to make out in general what this is, though as yet it has not been very definitely formulated. Probably the best way to describe it in a phrase is to call it the sociological view of history. As a rule historians will object to this term. It does not seem possible to them that any body of theory composed so largely of somewhat loose generalizations as sociology, can have anything in common with careful scientific history. Even more than the economist, the sociologist seems to them prone to play fast and loose with facts. He is an utter stranger to the chastening influence of "source materials". He rarely uses any documents except perhaps "human documents". Nevertheless it is to sociology that the new conception of history is most akin and it is with the sociologist that the historian is coming to have most in common. In spite of the great difference between them in the methods and materials used, and in the character of the results attained, their aims are to a large extent identical. The sociologist is seeking to discover the process by which society or civilization in all countries has evolved from the lowest types to the highest. What the historian now tries to do is to tell the story of the social development or evolution of one country or group of countries so far as this can be made out from the records of the past. It is no longer the political activity of a people and the development of their political institutions that is the centre of his thought. It is the development of the whole social fabric that he seeks to depict. It is this that gives unity and continuity to his subject and is coming to furnish a substitute for that political chronology which has so long provided the framework for all historical narrative. Thus the conception of society as an organism developing like other organisms under the influence of environment, which is the chief contribution that sociology has made to modern thought, is coming to affect fundamentally the historian's conception of his work. The failure of historians to recognize this kinship with sociology is matched by the indifference of sociologists to history. They are so preoccupied with primitive man that the course of social evolution among the great historical races is neglected. The institutions of the "Tudas and the peaceful Arifuras" continue to receive more attention at their hands than the German kingship, the village communities of

medieval Europe, or the feudal system. Few students of sociology in our universities are ever advised to take such an admirable sociological course as the early constitutional history of England.

It is easy to see how this new conception of history increases the historian's interest in economic affairs. It puts a premium on those matters which touch most closely the life of the masses of the people and so contribute most to determine the course of social evolution. It is not necessary to adopt Marx's view that all social structure is determined by economic life and all social development caused by economic changes; it is sufficient to recognize that here are to be found some of the great forces that have moulded institutions. How to make a living and what things affect their ability to do so have been the principal objects of interest to most people at all times in the history of the world. If history is to tell the story of the social evolution of nations it must give a great deal of attention to that part of human activity.

All these influences have combined to give to economic affairs that prominence in historical writing which they are now coming to occupy and interest in the subject on the part of historians bids fair to continue to increase rather than to decline.

We are now in a position to take up the question of what economic history ought to include if it is to be developed as a separate subject of study. From what has been said above concerning its relation to other subjects it may be assumed that its value will be chiefly for historians and sociologists rather than economists. Accepting this view, what ought to be its aim and what kind of economic history do we need most to have written? We may answer at once that the aim should not be to turn out works on the general history of countries written from an economic point of view. Whatever need there may be for the rewriting of history in order to give to economic influences their proper weight in social and political development, that work may be safely left to the general historian. There is no reason why a body of specialists should be trained to do it; and certainly there is no occasion for economists to turn their attention to the writing of history in order to secure that end. Historians, in this country at least, are in no danger at the present time of neglecting the economic factor in history. They seem disposed to provide all the "economic interpretation" that is likely to be required.

What is needed in the way of special work is something which can be separated quite definitely from the proper work of the historian, something which he can use to great advantage but which he cannot well provide for himself. There is need for a descrip-



tion and explanation of the economic life of each country during the course of its history. The process by which wealth is produced and distributed among individuals in a civilized community is a very complex affair, especially where division of labor has made any considerable progress. It involves the interest of every individual, for no one can live to himself in such a community. It is affected by a great variety of circumstances which differ much in different countries and in the same country at different stages of its development. The special task of the economic historian ought to be to analyze this all-embracing process as it has existed in each country at different times, and to explain it. His subject ought to be *the wealth of nations* in the literal sense of that phrase. He ought to make clear what factors have determined the ability of each nation to produce wealth at any particular time and what ones have influenced its distribution; and he should also reveal the forces which have acted to change economic conditions from time to time, producing economic progress or economic decline.

This is by no means a simple or easy thing to do. It involves much more than merely finding out the facts concerning the industries carried on by a people, the nature and volume of a country's trade, the various economic institutions which have existed in it, like the currency, the transportation system, land tenure, taxation, and the organization of labor and capital, together with the policy of the government in regard to these matters. All these facts and many more must be had, and it is difficult enough to ascertain them. But this work is not different from the ordinary work of the historian and requires no special training. What is far more difficult is the explanation of these facts. It is possible to know them without perceiving their significance and it is here that the chief difficulties of economic history are encountered. Economic conditions are all related. They are never isolated. They fit together to form that elaborate mechanism which creates and distributes the wealth of a nation. The important thing to determine concerning every event or fact is its relation to this process as a whole. It is not enough to know that New England had a large trade with the West Indies in certain commodities during the eighteenth century. The important thing is to understand just how that trade affected the ability of the community as a whole to satisfy its wants, and thus to be able to judge what the hampering of this trade or its interruption really meant to the people of New England. It is not sufficient to trace the growth of slavery in the Southern States and to show that it followed the invention of the cotton gin and the spread of cotton culture. What we want to know is why the introduction



of cotton culture into this country should have produced such a result; and above all to know how the growth of slavery affected the ability of the country as a whole to produce wealth—not only the ability of communities where slavery existed, but that of the rest of the country as well, for it is not alone in the field of politics that slavery influenced the life of the nation; it had a national economic influence quite as important as the political. In all such subjects as these it is necessary to view a wide range of facts in their relations to each other and to ascertain the effect of each event upon the national economy.

In order to exhibit more concretely the nature and importance of the sort of work I am seeking to describe it will be worth while to consider an example of it in more detail. One of the striking features of the economic development of this country during the first half of the nineteenth century was the rise of internal trade. While such trade had existed to some extent even in colonial times, its amount was too small to be of much importance down to as late a date as 1815. The New Englanders carried a little fish and a few manufactures like shoes, tinware, and wooden clocks to the Middle States and the South and brought back a little grain and in later years a little cotton. They also did some carrying of southern staples to Europe. The merchants of the seaboard cities sent a few articles of necessity and luxury to the back country and the Ohio valley, and a few herds of cattle were driven eastward from these regions to the seaboard, and a little produce sent down the Ohio and Mississippi to New Orleans. But the value of all this trade was, I repeat, insignificant before 1815. As an element in the economic life of the average person it played no important part. During the forty-five years from 1815 to 1860 these small rivulets of internal trade swelled into a great volume which at the latter date equalled in value, if it did not exceed, the foreign commerce of the country.

It is extremely difficult to find out the facts concerning the growth of this internal trade. There are no statistics, however imperfect, by which to measure its volume and value. There are only indications of its growth more or less indefinite. Perhaps the best of these are the statistics of steamboat tonnage on the rivers and of sail and steam tonnage on the lakes and in the coasting service. In addition to these it is necessary to study the growth of commercial towns and cities in the various localities and collect scraps of information concerning their trade from such sources as gazetteers, newspapers, and the writings of travellers; and finally in the latter part of the period to follow the building of railroads and study the

traffic of the principal trunk lines. In this way by diligent research it is possible to trace out the chief currents of the trade, to ascertain what commodities composed it, and to form a very rough guess of their value. There is nothing in all this different from the ordinary work of the historian except that the material is more fragmentary and incomplete than on most other subjects and requires to be pieced together with great care. But when this has been done and a fairly trustworthy result obtained, what does it all amount to? Is the development of this trade an important event or not? It certainly had no obvious, striking consequence, such as the rise of a slave power or the advent of a radical frontier democracy in our politics. Nor can its importance be inferred from its value alone. What then is its significance if it has any? It is only possible to answer that question by taking into consideration the economic life of the country as a whole and seeing exactly what change this trade brought about in the national economy.

From an economic point of view American society in 1815 can best be described as made up for the most part of small rural communities scattered over an immense area and having little commercial intercourse with each other or with the outside world. The only part of the country where this was not the case was a narrow strip of territory along the seaboard. The communities near tide-water and on or near navigable streams in this strip could and did carry on a small commerce with each other and a large commerce with foreign countries. But everywhere else the people lived in isolated, self-sufficing communities, which produced for themselves practically everything which they consumed. It may be noted that this feature of American society was much more prominent in 1815 than it had been before the Revolution. Then the settled area where these conditions prevailed could not have included more than about a third or possibly a half of the population. The rush of people into the West which followed the Revolution carried the settlements to the Mississippi and beyond by 1820 and spread the population over a large part of the intervening territory. The "back country", as it was called, where these conditions were most prominent, was expanded until it made up a large part of the country. Probably two-thirds of the population now lived under conditions of commercial isolation.

The effect of this great dispersion of our people upon their manners and political sentiments has received adequate attention, but its economic effects have been either ignored or treated very superficially. It did not, as is commonly assumed, bring any immediate economic advantage to the people as a whole; that is, it did

not increase their ability to produce wealth, but had rather the opposite effect. It greatly increased what had always been the chief obstacle to the production of wealth in American society, namely, lack of division of labor. In spite of the great energy and efficiency of the individual laborers, American industry in general was not highly productive in colonial times. There was always plenty of rude comfort but not much wealth. It was easy to produce the bare necessities but very difficult to produce anything more. This was due to the lack of division of labor. This phrase refers to two distinct though related features of industry. One is the separation of the laborers of a community into distinct industries or employments—more properly called division of employments; and the other is the combination and organization of laborers in each industry. Now the only communities in America where either of these features of industry had ever been developed to any considerable extent before 1815 were those in the tidewater region. Owing to the existence of domestic and foreign trade it was possible for a considerable part of the inhabitants of that region to devote their labors to a few industries in which natural resources were very rich and to depend upon the labor of others to produce whatever else they needed—in other words, to develop division of employment. Here too there was some combination and organization of labor, chiefly in the South, where it was made possible by the existence of slavery. There was a beginning of it also in the North in fishing, lumbering, shipbuilding, and a few small manufacturing industries. But everywhere else over the whole country industry was undifferentiated and unorganized. In the back country almost every one tilled the soil and every farmer was a Jack-of-all-trades. Each family produced most of what it consumed and exchanged very little with other families in the same community. They all produced about the same things. Each little community produced within itself nine-tenths and more of what it consumed, drawing almost nothing from other communities. Combination and organization of labor in the modern sense were practically unknown, and division of employment had scarcely advanced beyond a rudimentary stage. And these back-country conditions, it must be remembered, had come to prevail over the larger part of the country. They were to be found everywhere except in the tidewater strip and may be said to be typical of the country during this period.

If we bear these facts in mind the significance and importance of the rise of internal trade will at once become apparent. It was in fact the introduction into American society generally, for the first time, of the practice of division of labor, which Adam Smith rightly

regarded as the most important circumstance affecting the ability of a community to produce wealth. As this trade grew it became possible for the first time for most of the people to devote themselves to the production of one or a few products in which their labor was productive, and to depend upon other communities in this country or the outside world for what they could produce only at a disadvantage. The markets which now arose for various commodities opened the way also for combination and organization of labor in various industries and localities where it had been unknown before. It began to show itself in the iron works of Pittsburgh, in the slaughter-houses and machine-shops of Cincinnati, the hemp mills of Kentucky, and the sawmills of Michigan. The economic advantages which had before been enjoyed only by the people of the seaboard were now extended to the whole country. There was nothing spectacular in these changes. They came about gradually and quietly. But in the course of a generation they wrought what amounted to an industrial revolution over the greater part of the country. This rise of internal trade must therefore be considered an event of enormous economic importance, far transcending the introduction of the factory system into the textile industries of the country, to which so much attention has been given.

So much for an example of what is involved in the work of explaining and interpreting economic events. It is obvious that we have here something very different from the ordinary work of the historian. It can be done only by those who are familiar with economic science. It is in fact an attempt to apply that science to the facts of a country's economic life at a particular period of its history, and to make it serve as a guide for their explanation. Here is a kind of economic interpretation of history for which there is a legitimate basis and which historians need not regard as an impertinence on the part of economists. Here is an opportunity for the economist to render a genuine service to history by turning his attention to it, and confining himself to those aspects of it with which his professional training has fitted him to deal.

I do not of course mean that economic science can always be relied upon to furnish the true explanation of past economic conditions. Professor Ashley used to insist that we should never be able to understand the economic life of medieval Europe so long as we studied it from the point of view of classical political economy; and Professor Schmoller has shown us how inadequate as history is Adam Smith's account of the mercantile system. The danger of this sort of error is not so great in American history as in these cases, but examples of it are not entirely lacking there. It is not

uncommon for economists who are much interested in the tariff controversy of our own time to fail to recognize how different were the conditions affecting this subject in Clay's and Hamilton's time. A similar defect appears in Professor Commons's otherwise admirable *Documentary History of American Industrial Society*. His mind is so preoccupied with trades-unions and the present problems of the wage-earning class that he ignores entirely the real labor problem of American society during the first half of the nineteenth century. That problem was, not at all how to protect wage-earners from injury due to over-competition, as was the case in Europe, but how to induce people to become wage-earners and thus to secure that combination of labor which was the greatest economic need of the time. American society was not suffering from any of the evils of congestion of its population, but, as we have seen, from just the opposite thing—the too great dispersion of the population over a wide extent of territory. Such errors as these, however, can be easily avoided by the economist who becomes a specialist in dealing with the economic life of the past. He will gradually come to recognize and make due allowance for the differences between present conditions and past. He will cultivate an historical sense and acquire historical-mindedness, and with these he can use his knowledge of present economic relations which economic science provides, to interpret past conditions without danger of serious error. This, it seems to me, is the special study which ought to be developed, and this is the kind of economic history we most need to bring into existence.

It remains to speak briefly of the work which has been done in this field. Only three books have been written which undertake to deal even in the briefest fashion with the economic life of the nation as a whole. Eighteen years ago Carroll D. Wright published what he called *The Industrial Evolution of the United States*.<sup>1</sup> It in no way came up to the promise of its title, and deserves mention only because it was the first attempt to consider the subject from this point of view. In 1905 Miss Coman's *Industrial History of the United States*<sup>2</sup> appeared. Regarding "political events and social changes as conditioned on industrial evolution", the author aims "to bring the essential elements of our [economic] history within the grasp of the average reader". Her book is a compilation of facts, with little attention to that work of explanation which ought to be the most prominent feature. What the essential elements of our economic history are, that is, what events have been

<sup>1</sup> New York, Chautauqua-Century Press, 1895.

<sup>2</sup> New York, The Macmillan Company, 1905.

most influential in determining the course of development, can only be discovered by giving attention to that aspect of the subject, and inevitably there is great lack of discrimination in the selection and arrangement of facts. Bogart's *Economic History of the United States*<sup>3</sup> is much more successful in selecting for treatment those subjects which are really essential to any understanding of economic development; and the author has kept steadily in mind his declared intention "to bring out clearly the causal relation of events". Although this work of explanation is very brief and often superficial, the author appreciates its importance. His book is however chiefly useful because it brings together the available facts and digests the results of such investigations as have been made. It is a good beginning in a neglected field.

Before any such reasoned account of economic development as we have described can be written, a vast amount of preparatory work must be done. We must know in detail how individuals and communities have made a living and what circumstances have affected their ability to do so. The immediate need is for the same careful, painstaking study of economic activity which historians have given to political activity. We are fortunate in possessing in the Department of Economics and Sociology in the Carnegie Institution of Washington a well-organized and subsidized enterprise designed to accomplish precisely this work. For a decade it has been stimulating investigations by grants of money and seeking to initiate and guide them by its organization. To a large extent it is responsible for the work which has been done during that period, and a glance at the results of its activities affords striking evidence of the progress that has been made. According to its latest report fifty-two monographs prepared under its direction have been published and one hundred and eight have been finished but remain unpublished. Besides this, sixty-one shorter studies have been published in periodicals, a large portion of which, however, are merely parts of the published and unpublished monographs. To this must be added a considerable list of monographs that have originated in the graduate schools of the various universities and in the different departments of the federal government. Altogether these make up an imposing mass of material. It is only possible here to indicate in general terms how far it has prepared the way for an economic history of the country.

Broadly speaking, there are at least three well-defined types of special study which ought to be multiplied in order to make such a work possible. First, there should be histories of the important in-

<sup>3</sup> New York, Lothrop, Green and Company, first ed., 1907, second ed., 1912.



dustries in agriculture, forestry, mining, and manufactures. Secondly, there should be studies of what for want of any other name may be called economic institutions—the currency, the transportation system, public finances, land tenure, and the various phases of the organization of labor and capital, such as slavery, trades-unions, and corporations. Single great enterprises in transportation and banking as well as branches of foreign and domestic commerce belong to the first type. Studies of governmental policy naturally form a part of both the first and the second. The third type is quite different in character from the other two. It is synthetic not analytic. It deals not with some one factor of economic life but considers in detail the whole economic activity of some one community or section where conditions are the same. The country naturally divides itself into regions according to differences in economic conditions and interests. These make up what may be called economic provinces. Such are New England, the Middle States, the Lower South, the Border States, the old Northwest, the Pacific coast, and the great mountain region of the Far West. Detailed studies of the economic life of each of these regions or of single states in them are examples of this type.

An examination of the existing mass of publications reveals a surprising deficiency among them under all three of these heads. The number of important industries whose history has been thoroughly investigated is very small. There are only a few such monographs as Wright's *Wool-Growing*, McFarland's *Fisheries*, Hammond's *Cotton Industry*, and Marvin's *Merchant Marine*. No such studies have been made of slaughtering and meat-packing, lumbering, flour-milling, salt-making, coal-mining, gold and silver-mining, the telegraph, steamboat navigation, and the express business, all of which have played an important part in our economic life. The same is true of a great number of minor manufactures, such as shoe-making, sugar-refining, tanning, and the production of clothing, furniture, and agricultural implements. In case of those manufactures which have received most attention, iron and the textiles, the aim has been to find out the influence of the tariff rather than to explain the development of these industries. The wide field of industrial history in the strict sense of the term still remains largely unworked. The situation is somewhat better as regards economic institutions. Money and banking, the canals and railways, and the finances of the federal government are the subjects which have received more attention than any others in our economic history. A good beginning has also been made in labor problems, especially trades unions; but an adequate treatment of



slavery and of the problems which grew out of emancipation is still conspicuously lacking. The growth of capital and the development of the great institution by means of which it is collected and applied to industry, the corporation, have hardly received any attention at all.

Studies of the third type are the least developed of all. An excellent example in Bruce's *Economic History of Virginia in the Seventeenth Century* was among the first fruits of the new interest in this subject. A still earlier and a less valuable work was Weeden's *Economic and Social History of New England before 1789*. Almost the only study of this kind which has been published since these works is the recent *Economic Beginnings of the Far West* by Miss Coman. It fails to have equal value with them because there is no unity to the economic life of this region during the period that it covers. Something approaching this type of study is appearing in connection with the study of the history of agriculture and transportation. It is impossible to study agriculture by industries since division of employments has not developed there as in all other fields of production. The different branches of agriculture are more or less connected in most regions and it is necessary in studying it to consider the larger part of the economic activity of whole communities. Several such works appear in the unpublished monographs of the Carnegie Institution. For a different reason studies in transportation lead to a similar result. The introduction into a community of modern facilities of transportation is such a revolutionary influence that the treatment of it involves the consideration of almost all the economic activities of that community. Nowhere can be found so good a brief account of the economic life of the Southeastern States during the first three decades of the nineteenth century as appears in the early chapters of Phillips's *History of Transportation in the Eastern Cotton Belt*. Gephart's *Transportation and Industrial Development in the Middle West* is a less successful effort to trace the industrial growth of the state of Ohio as it was affected by transportation. Historical students ought to contribute largely to this third type of study, since it depends upon the careful collection of a great variety of facts. Fite's *Social and Industrial Conditions in the North during the Civil War* represents a kind of work which might well be imitated.

It is clear from this brief survey that the work of investigation needs to be carried much further and to be systematized so that the most important subjects shall receive most attention. It is to be hoped that the Carnegie Institution will not relax its efforts to stimulate and direct such work. A closer organization of the

collaborators, with a more definite plan of the work which they are seeking to produce, would be likely to secure more valuable results. Co-operative enterprises in historical research have never succeeded without such a plan and some one to hold the co-operators up to it. In view of the character of much of the work required as well as the present attitude of the two national associations toward economic history it would be well also to enlist the more active interest of historians in the enterprise.

GUY S. CALLENDER.

## DOCUMENTS

### *Notes of Colonel W. G. Moore, Private Secretary to President Johnson, 1866-1868*

[The introduction to these notes is contributed by Professor St. George L. Sioussat of Vanderbilt University, to whom we are also indebted for procuring the text. The annotations have been supplied by the managing editor, with some aid from Professor Sioussat. A reference to Colonel Moore's intimate knowledge of President Johnson's affairs, especially at the time of the impeachment trial, and apparently also a reference to this private record, may be seen in S. S. Cox's *Three Decades of Federal Legislation*, p. 591.]

WILLIAM GEORGE MOORE, the compiler of these "Notes", was born November 30, 1829, and died July 22, 1898. He served as a private, corporal, and sergeant in the National Rifles, District of Columbia Volunteers, April 15 to July 15, 1861. From May 1, 1865, to November 5, 1866, he was assistant adjutant-general of volunteers, with the rank of major. November 14, 1866, he was appointed paymaster with the rank of major, but his testimony at the impeachment trial showed that his real function was that of private secretary to the President. December 2, 1865, he was commissioned brevet lieutenant-colonel and colonel of volunteers, and March 2, 1867, lieutenant-colonel in the U. S. Army, for faithful and meritorious service. He resigned April 12, 1870. In December, 1886, he was appointed major and superintendent of police of the District of Columbia and he retained this office until the time of his death.

In the impeachment proceedings he was summoned by the prosecution to testify as to his correction of a report of one of the President's speeches; and by the defense to give evidence in the matter of the delivery of Thomas Ewing's nomination as Secretary of War.

Colonel Moore enjoyed the entire confidence of President Johnson. According to his own testimony, his service as secretary began in November, 1865. An expert stenographer, he made use of the opportunities which his position afforded him to take down, in shorthand, remarks and conversations which seemed of interest and importance. The "Notes" which follow were transcribed by him, apparently during the impeachment proceedings, in his own (long) hand. The volume in which they are contained—a bound diary or journal book of 1868—is among the papers of President Johnson

which remain in the possession of Hon. A. J. Patterson, of Greenville, Tennessee, a grandson of President Johnson, who has kindly consented to their publication.

It may be added that most of the originals of the letters, scrap-books, etc., to which reference is made in the "Notes", are now among the Johnson Manuscripts in the Library of Congress.

ST. GEORGE L. SIOUSSAT.

May 7, 1867. { Secy Stanton,  
and Jeff. Davis.

At Cabinet meeting today Secretary Stanton submitted, with an endorsement "Respy referred to the President for his instructions", a letter addressed to the War Dept. by L. H. Chandler, U. S. Dist. Atty. for Va., dated Norfolk, May 4, 1867, requesting "an order upon the Commandant at Fortress Monroe, directing him to surrender Jefferson Davis to the U. S. Marshal or his deputies, upon any process which may issue from the Federal Court." The President asked, "Well, Mr. Secretary, what recommendation have you to make in this case?" The Secretary: "I have no recommendation to make." The President thereupon directed that the application should be "returned to the Honble the Secretary of War, who will at once issue the order requested by District Attorney Chandler."<sup>1</sup>

The President narrated the above incident as illustrative of the manner in which the Secretary avoided responsibility.

October, 1866. { Mexican Mission  
and Genl. Grant.

The Cabinet had for some time had under consideration the question of the occupation of Mexico by the military forces of the French. It was finally determined that definite instructions should be given to Lewis D. Campbell,<sup>2</sup> who had been some time before appointed Minister to Mexico, but had been prevented from proceeding to that country by its disturbed condition. Upon the President's own suggestion, it was decided that, in order that *prestige* might be given to his mission, he should proceed in a war vessel and be accompanied by General Grant. This arrangement, however, was defeated by the General, who, although he had been consulted upon the subject by the President, and when he had urged that he desired to be in Washington upon the assembling of Congress,<sup>3</sup> had been told that he could easily do so, (the moral influence of his presence with our Minister and his advice being all that was desired,) declined to receive instructions from the Secretary of State at the hands of Mr. Campbell, alleging that being in the military service of the U. S., he was not subject to orders from the State Dept. The letter of Secretary Seward, however, expressly stated, "*By direction of the President, I request you to proceed to Mexico, or its vicinity, to act in concert there with and as an adviser of Lewis D. Campbell, Esqr. Minister Plenipotentiary of the U. S. to the Republic of Mexico.*" Mr. Seward's letter bore date Oct. 20, 1866.

<sup>1</sup> The order, dated May 8, and in the words above, is printed in Mrs. Davis's *Jefferson Davis*, II. 790. Mrs. Davis relates how Stanton's consent was secured, through John W. Garrett.

<sup>2</sup> Representative from Ohio 1849-1853, 1871-1873, minister to Mexico 1866-1868.

<sup>3</sup> *I. e.*, at the beginning of December, 1866.

To meet this objection of Genl. Grant, on the 25th. of Oct. 1866, the President prepared a letter to the Secretary of War, (Mr. Stanton,) in these terms: "You will please instruct Genl. Ulysses S. Grant, commanding the armies of the U. S., to proceed to Mexico or its vicinity, there to act in concert with and as an adviser of L. D. Campbell, Esq." etc. This letter, however, was submitted to the Cabinet on the day next succeeding its date, when, after full consideration, it was decided, as the opinion of the Heads of Depts., that as the duty asked of Genl. Grant was of a civil character, and might, if questioned, give rise to doubts as to the authority of the Government to send him on such a mission, the communication for the Sec. of War was modified so as to state the object of the embassy and "to ask that you will request Genl. Grant to proceed to some point on our Mexican frontier most suitable and convenient for communication with our Minister, or (if Genl. Grant deems it best) to accompany him to his destination in Mexico, and to give him the aid of his advice in carrying out the instructions of the Sec. of State," etc.

The above quoted letter was dated the 26th Oct. 1866, and was sent to the War Dept. the succeeding day. In the afternoon of the same day the Sec. of War enclosed the reply of Genl. Grant, as follows:

"The same request was made of me one week ago today, verbally, to which I returned a written reply, a copy of which is herewith enclosed. On the 23d instant the same request was renewed in Cabinet meeting, where I was invited to be present, when I again declined, respectfully as I could, the mission tendered to me, with reasons. I now again beg most respectfully to decline the proposed mission, for the following additional reasons to wit: Now, whilst the army is being reorganized and troops distributed as fast as organized, my duties require me to keep within telegraphic communication of all the department commanders and of this city, from which orders must emanate.\* Almost the entire frontier between the U. S. and Mexico is embraced in the depts. commanded by Genls. Sheridan and Hancock, the command of the latter being embraced in the military division under Lieut. Genl. Sherman—three officers in whom the entire country has unbounded confidence. Either of these general officers can be instructed to accompany the American Minister to the Mexican boundary, or the one can through whose command the Minister may propose to pass in reaching his destination. If it is desirable that our Minister should communicate with me, he can do so through the officer who may accompany him, with but very little delay beyond what would be experienced if I were to accompany him myself. I might add that I would not dare counsel the Minister in any matter beyond the stationing of troops on U. S. soil, without the concurrence of the Administration. That concurrence could be more speedily had with me here than if I were upon the frontier. The stationing of troops would be as fully within the control of the commanding officer as it would of mine.

"I sincerely hope I may be excused from undertaking a duty so foreign to my office and tastes as that contemplated."

The President expressed some surprise at this result. He said that when on Wednesday, Oct. 17, 1866, he sent for Genl. Grant and mentioned the subject to him, he thought the General evinced satisfaction, if not pleasure at the proposed arrangement. Immediately after the

\* It was not until March 2, 1867, that Army Hd: Qrs. were, by law, fixed at Washington.—May not the above correspondence have suggested Sec. 2 of the Act of that date? (*Note in the original.*)

interview, the President visited the State Dept. and informed the Secretary of the result. The next morning, according to appointment, Genl. Grant called at the Executive Mansion, and Col. Moore<sup>4</sup> was dispatched to the State Dept. to notify Mr. Seward that the General would either await him at the President's, or call on the Secretary at any hour he might designate. The Secretary requested Col. Moore to say to the President and Genl. Grant that the instructions had just been completed, and that he would at once bring them to the President. (The State Dept. at that time occupied the locality now covered by the north wing of the Treasury Building.)<sup>5</sup> The Secretary accordingly made his appearance, and the instructions prepared for Mr. Campbell were read to Genl. Grant, to ascertain whether or not he had any suggestions to make. He said he had none to submit. On the succeeding Sunday Genl. Grant addressed a letter to the President, dated Oct. 21, 1866, stating:

"On further and full reflection upon the subject of my accepting the mission proposed by you in our interview of Wednesday, and again yesterday, I have most respectfully to beg to be excused from the duty proposed. It is a diplomatic service for which I am not fitted, either by education or taste. It has necessarily to be conducted under the State Dept., with which my duties do not connect me. Again, then, I most urgently, but respectfully repeat my request to be excused from the performance of a duty entirely out of my sphere, and one too which can be so much better performed by others."

It was subsequently to the transmission of the above letter to the President that Genl. Grant declined to receive from Mr. Campbell the instructions of the Secretary of State.

For all the official communications upon this subject, see the package of papers, marked "Genl. Grant and Mexico."<sup>6</sup>

Reasons other than those stated by Genl. Grant were by some assumed to have influenced his action in the matter of the mission to Mexico, and prominent among them was supposed jealousy of Sherman. Just about this time the papers had published a rumor that Mr. Stanton would resign and be sent as Ambassador to Spain, and that he would be succeeded in the War Dept. by Genl. Sherman, who in Febry. 1866 had addressed a letter to the President, strongly endorsing his policy of reconstruction. The fact that such a letter had been written by him to the President had but recently become known, and but a short time had intervened since Mr. Johnson had read the communication to Genl. Grant, at its conclusion remarking that he thought of publishing it—a suggestion which the President said the General did not appear to relish.<sup>7</sup> It was therefore concluded by some that Genl. Grant was afraid that should he leave the country, Sherman would first be exalted

<sup>4</sup> The writer of these notes, private secretary to the President.

<sup>5</sup> From 1820 to October, 1866, the Department of State was located on the site now covered by the north part of the Treasury. In October, 1866, it leased the premises of the Washington Orphan Asylum, on Fourteenth Street near S Street, where it remained until 1875. The phrase shows that this portion of Colonel Moore's notes was not put into its present shape until the site had been "covered by the north wing of the Treasury Building"; the foundations of that wing were laid in April, 1867, and the construction was completed in 1869.

<sup>6</sup> See Welles's *Diary*, II. 621. As to the packages or bundles to which the diarist refers, and which are mostly now in the Library of Congress, see Professor Sioussat's introduction, *ad fin.*

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 607; *Sherman Letters* (ed. Thorndike, New York, 1894), p. 279.

to his own position as the head of the Army, and thence transferred to the office of Secy of War, and thus become his (Grant's) superior in office.

Oct. 26, 1866, Lieut. Genl. Sherman called upon the Presidt. After the positive declination or refusal of Genl. Grant to go to Mexico, the President sent for Genl. Sherman, and found that he was entirely willing to undertake the duty.<sup>8</sup> The Presidt. asked him when he would be ready to go,—“At once” was the prompt and soldierlike response.—A letter was on the 30th Oct. sent to the Sec. of War, saying that “Genl. Ulysses S. Grant having found it inconvenient to assume the duties specified in my letter of the 26th. instant, you will please relieve him from the same, and assign them in all respects to Wm. T. Sherman, Lieut. Genl. of the Army of the U. S.” (see the papers marked “Genl. Grant and Mexico.”)

Grade of General.—July 1866.

The President hesitated some time before he signed the bill “to revive the grade of General in the United States Army,” which he approved July 25, 1866. He considered the law inexpedient and unnecessary, saying that Washington had never been tendered a higher compliment than the rank of Lieut. Genl., already possessed by Grant; that the war had entirely ceased, the army been largely reduced, and that an additional grade could not give more effect to Grant's services than had already been done by conferring upon him the rank he now enjoyed. Secy Stanton had also suggested that the bill should be materially [maturely?] considered prior to approval, as it partook of the nature of giving a title or a distinction, etc. He, however, finally recommended that the President should attach to it his signature.

While the bill was in the hands of the President, he told me that General Grant called at the Executive Mansion, and requested that when his name should be sent to the Senate for Genl., Sherman's should accompany it for Lieut. General. He thus took it for granted that he would undoubtedly receive the promotion, although the law expressly empowered the President to make the selection “from among those officers in the military service of the U. S. most distinguished for courage, skill, and ability, who, being commissioned as Genl., may be authorized, under the direction and during the pleasure of the President, to command the Armies of the U. States.”

New Orleans Riot—July, 1866.

The President believed that the riot which occurred in the City of New Orleans, July 30, 1866, would have been averted if an answer had been sent to Genl. Baird's telegram of the 28th. asking the Secretary of War for instructions. This despatch was not seen by the President until some time after the riot, when at his suggestion all the papers on the subject in possession of the War Dept. were prepared for publication and sent to the Executive Mansion. In examining the correspondence the President for the first time saw Genl. Baird's despatch:—(See Secretary Stanton's and Col. Moore's testimony before the Congressional Committee on the New Orleans riots, contained in printed volume.)<sup>9</sup>

<sup>8</sup> *Sherman Letters*, pp. 280–283.

<sup>9</sup> *House Report No. 16*, 39 Cong., 2 sess., pp. 534–536, 546–547. General Absalom Baird was in temporary command at New Orleans in the absence of Sheridan, the general commanding the district. Baird's telegram may be seen in *Trial of President Johnson*, I. 152, or in Gorham's *Stanton*, II. 316; Stanton's explanation, *ibid.*, pp. 324–325.



Maryland Troubles—Oct. and Nov. 1866.<sup>10</sup>

The package of papers marked "Maryland and the District of Columbia" shows the anxiety and determination of the President to preserve peace in Baltimore when serious disorders were threatened just prior to the Nov. election. Genl. Grant was opposed to the interference of the military, his position being explained by his letter to the President dated Oct. 24, 1866, which concludes as follows: "It is a contingency I hope never to see arise in this country whilst I occupy the position of General-in-Chief of the Army, to have to send troops into a State *in full relations with the* Genl. Government, on the eve of an election, to preserve the peace. If insurrection does come, the law provides the method of calling out forces to suppress it. No such condition seems to exist now."

After some correspondence between the President, the War Dept. and Army Hd. Qrs., the President on the 1st of November 1866, requested the Sec. of War to take all measures necessary to ensure the safety of the seat of government, and on the next day addressed another communication to that officer, desiring that the attention of Genl. Grant should be called to the state of affairs in Baltimore, in order that measures of preparation and precaution might be adopted.

Gov. Swann<sup>11</sup> was much in consultation with the President in reference to the threatened troubles in Baltimore, urging that a knowledge of the fact that the Government was prepared to suppress disorder would prevent any serious riot.

Recruits embarked at New York for Texas were ordered to stop en route at Fort McHenry, there to remain until all apprehensions of difficulty had passed away.

Tennessee Troubles—July, 1867.

The following telegram of Genl. Grant was deemed in striking contrast with his views in reference to Federal interference for the preservation of peace in Maryland:

"LONG BRANCH, N. J.

"July 23, 1867.

"To the

Hon: E. M. Stanton,  
Secretary of War.

"Genl. Dent, with despatches from Genl. Thomas,<sup>12</sup> arrived before your telegram. I directed Genl. Thomas to give orders for the most vigorous use of the military to preserve order on election day, and not to wait until people are killed and the mob beyond control before interfering. I will direct Genl. Thomas to go directly to Memphis in person, but do not think there is any need of my going to Nashville."

U. S. GRANT,  
General."

Tennessee had been by act of Congress, approved July 24, 1866, restored to her relations to the Union, and occupied precisely the same position to the Govt. as Maryland, when Genl. Grant declared his abhorrence to sending "troops into a State in full relations with the Genl. Government, on the eve of an election, to preserve the peace."

<sup>10</sup> The events can be followed in Mr. Knott's account in Nelson's *Baltimore*, pp. 558-562.

<sup>11</sup> Thomas Swann, governor of Maryland 1865-1869.

<sup>12</sup> Lorenzo Thomas, adjutant-general.

July 25, 1867.

When the President read me the despatch of Genl. Grant to Mr. Stanton, I at once inquired if the first-named had given any instructions upon the subject. He said none whatever, but that on the preceding Cabinet day (Tuesday, July 23d) the subject of the Tennessee troubles had been mentioned, when the Secretary (Mr. Stanton) proposed to use the military for the preservation of order. "This" (said the President) "was the very thing I desired, but I said nothing, and could scarce keep from smiling at the readiness with which the Secretary proposed to do in Tennessee what he and Grant earnestly opposed doing under similar circumstances in Maryland".<sup>13</sup>

January 4, 1867. { Dis. of Col.  
Suffrage bill

The President had read to the Cabinet to-day his message returning to Congress, with his objections, the District of Columbia suffrage bill. All approved it, but Secy Stanton, who suggested that negro suffrage had to be tried, and that the experiment might as well begin in the District as any where else.<sup>14</sup>

"North Carolina"  
Plan of Reconstruction.

*January 30, 1867.*—Gov. Orr, of S. C., Gov. Marvin, of Florida, Gov. Parsons, of Ala., Messrs. Haines and Boyden, of N. C.<sup>15</sup> had a protracted consultation this afternoon, with the President, as to a proposition to amend the Constitution which should be submitted to Congress as the Southern plan of reconstruction. It was proposed that North Carolina should take the initiative by the adoption of a proposition first to amend her own Constitution, and then that of the United States. The draft of the proposed amendments was in the handwriting of Mr. Lewis C. Haines, and after some discussion it was modified in several particulars upon the suggestion of the President.

*January 31, 1867.*—The above-named subject was again considered, the same persons being present, except Gov. Marvin. The President suggested the omission from the plan of the request that an assurance should be given the State that upon the adoption of the proposed amendment to the Constitution, Representatives and Senators should be admitted to Congress, and, further, that it should be simply a proposition to amend the Constitution of the State and to submit to the several States an amendment to the Federal Constitution, similar in very many of its provisions to that proposed by the 39th. Congress. The President sent me in the evening to call on Messrs. Orr, Haines, and Boyden at the Ebbitt House, with the suggestion that the proposition should contain, *first*, the amendment to the Federal Constitution, and *next* the suggestions in reference to the Constitution of the State.

In the discussion upon these propositions, it seemed to be the opinion that if they should be sustained by all the Southern States and presented with the influence of a united front, they would operate as a

<sup>13</sup> See Welles, III. 140-141.

<sup>14</sup> The discussion is reported by Welles, III. 3-6.

<sup>15</sup> James L. Orr, governor of South Carolina 1865-1868; William Marvin, provisional governor of Florida in 1865; Lewis E. Parsons, provisional governor of Alabama in 1865; Lewis Hanes, elected to Congress in 1866 but not seated, and in 1867 agent of North Carolina in Washington; Nathaniel Boyden, representative from North Carolina 1868-1869.

flank movement against and defeat the Radical programme, which, as was then supposed, it had already been demonstrated could not be adopted by a vote of the States. Govr. Orr told Colo. Moore in the evening that he had been informed by Representative Bingham, of Ohio, that the article for the exclusion of certain persons from office, embraced in the constitutional amendment proposed by Congress, was the work of Thad. Stevens; that it had been defeated in a full committee, but in the absence of Fessenden and Washburne, of Illinois, on account of sickness, Stevens had succeeded in obtaining a reconsideration of the vote, and the adoption of the article as a part of the plan. (See the papers marked "Reconstruction-Proposition to amend the Federal Constitution and the Constitution of North Carolina.")

February 9, 1867.

The President visited Mr. George Peabody this morning, at Willard's Hotel, as a mark of respect to one who had made such liberal provision for the cause of education in the South.<sup>16</sup>

February 14, 1867.

The President is evidently deeply impressed with the necessity of some effort to prevent the extreme measures proposed by the majority in Congress. Mr. Banks, of Mass.<sup>17</sup> visited him this morning. Before being admitted to the President's office, Mr. Banks said to me that in his view there should be some one in the Cabinet who could be approached by those who were in opposition to the President, and who could thus become a channel of communication between the Executive and Congress. He suggested Horace Greeley as Postmaster General, in place of Mr. Randall,<sup>18</sup> and his great anxiety in reference to reconstruction seemed to be lest, by admitting representatives from the "Rebel States," the disloyal element might again preponderate in those States, and perhaps in Congress. He gave the South credit for having men of great ability, who would be able to exercise much influence in the legislative councils of the nation.

At lunch I mentioned the subject to the President. He said it would not take him long to send for Mr. Greeley and that he could not perceive that any member of his Cabinet gave him any strength with the country. He (the President) believed that by appointing Grant as Sec. of War, Farragut as Sec. of the Navy, Chas. F. Adams as Sec. of State, and Greeley as Postmaster General, he could settle the question in two hours. He said, however, that such a course would occasion harsh feelings on the part of some of the Cabinet officers who would thus be relieved, and to some of whom he was much attached. I asked him if there was no way in which he could carry out such plans? He replied that he did not know that there was; and as the subject was evidently painful to him, I let the matter drop.

March 2, 1867.

The veto of the military reconstruction bill<sup>19</sup> was approved by all the members of the Cabinet, except Mr. Stanton.

<sup>16</sup> The Peabody Fund had been established in the preceding year.

<sup>17</sup> Nathaniel P. Banks.

<sup>18</sup> Alexander W. Randall of Wisconsin.

<sup>19</sup> Richardson, *Messages of the Presidents*, VI. 498-511.

March 4, 1867 { Military appro-  
piation bill.

The President and Cabinet went to the Capitol this morning, to be present at the adjournment. The President took with him, unsigned, the military appropriation bill, the second section of which requires that all military orders from the President and Sec. of War shall pass through Genl. Grant. President Johnson had determined that he would not approve a bill containing such an objectionable feature. Each member of the Cabinet, however, was asked his opinion upon the subject, and it was concluded (at the Capitol) that the President should approve the bill, under protest, which was done. When the President asked the Secretary of War if he was in favor of a protest, the reply was "I make no objection to it." "But", said the President, "I wish to know whether you approve of a protest?" the secretary: "I approve your taking whatever course you may think best."

May 2d, 1867. { Purchase of  
Russian America.

The President expressed the belief today that had it not been for the War Dept. all of our troubles would long since have been healed. He said he was convinced that that Dept. had thrown every obstacle in the way of the consummation of his plans for restoration. In this connection he alluded to the course of Secretary Stanton on the Russian-American treaty, remarking that when the question first came before the Cabinet he (the President) had merely listened to the discussion, without taking part *pro* or *con*, and that, so far as he could judge, it was determined unanimously that the acquisition was a desirable one. Mr. Stanton sustained the treaty in Cabinet, and thought it ought to be consummated. Subsequently, in a conversation with the Sec. of War, the President alluded to the evident gratification of Mr. Seward upon the ratification of the treaty. "Yes", said Mr. Stanton, with a significant look, "you don't know the half of it," and then proceeded to criticize the acquisition, declaring that it was a country of ice and rock; that \$7,000,000 in gold were equal to \$10,000,000 in currency, the yearly interest upon which was \$600,000; that a territorial government, with the necessary military force, would create an annual expenditure of more than a million; and that during war it were better that it should be in the hands of a friendly Power than in our possession, as we must take means for its defence. The President told me he was surprised at the Secretary's remarks, and had concluded that because it had added to Mr. Seward's popularity before the country, Mr. Stanton was somewhat envious, and now wished to depreciate the value of Alaska as an acquisition. The President seemed inclined to believe that Mr. Stanton had originally favored the treaty because he believed that it would eventually become unpopular and bring odium upon Mr. Seward, when Mr. Stanton would feel himself at liberty to denounce the purchase and decry its wisdom.

In the latter days of April, 1867, the music stand was erected in the President's grounds for the summer. When the workmen were raising the flag-pole, the President remarked that he was present when the stars and stripes were first raised in the grounds by Presidt. Lincoln; that as Mr. Lincoln hoisted the colors, they somehow or other became entangled, and split; that although he (Mr. Johnson) was not superstitious, the incident at the time made an impression on his mind that it had been difficult entirely to efface.

Friday, Apl. 5, 1867.

Cabinet met at nine o'clock this morning, in accordance with a request of Atty. General Stanbery made the evening before.—The object of the meeting was to decide what should be done upon the application made to the Supreme Court of the U. S. by Gov. Sharkey and R. J. Walker for an injunction to restrain the President from executing the military reconstruction act. It was agreed by the Cabinet that the Attorney Genl. should appear before the Court at 12 o'clock to-day and resist the motion—the only Secretary not expressing an opinion being Mr. Stanton, who said he was willing to defer in the matter to the judgment of the Attorney General.<sup>20</sup>

The President considered this another attempt at evasion, and reiterated the belief that if it had not been for the pernicious influence exerted by the War Dept. over the "extreme gang" in Congress, during the first session of the 39th Congress, all the troubles that now divided the people would long since have been brought to a close. A gentleman had informed him that before Mr. Stanton became Secy. of War he heard Mr. S. allude to President Lincoln as "a damned baboon, grinning over the misfortunes of the country."

April, 1867.

A Mrs. Hodges, whose husband is a clerk of the House Judiciary Committee engaged in the impeachment investigation, called upon and informed the President that it was a "regular understanding" that if the Committee could not obtain sufficient testimony to impeach the President, they were to manufacture it, and, for the purpose of gold speculations, would bring in a resolution of impeachment at the Session to meet on the first Wednesday in July. (See her "developments" in the package marked "Dunham, alias Conover.")<sup>21</sup>

August 1, 1867.— { Mr. Stanton  
                                  { requested to resign, etc.

The President directed me to-day to write a letter in the following terms, viz:

"Sir: Public considerations of a high character constrain me to say that your resignation as Secretary of War will be accepted. Very respectfully yours,

ANDREW JOHNSON.

"To the Honorable Edwin M. Stanton," etc.

The President said that for a year past Mr. Stanton must have seen that his resignation would at any time have been acceptable to the Executive. When the above letter was written Genl. Grant had just had an interview with the President, having been sent for. The President informed him of his intentions with regard to Mr. Stanton, and that he would be pleased to have the General act as Secretary of War. Genl. Grant urged that such a step would be impolitic, and that those who sought Mr. Stanton's removal were generally persons who had opposed the war. Besides, there were many claims pending in the War Dept. of which he (Grant) knew nothing, and of his ability to determine which he entertained serious doubts. The President replied that it could

<sup>20</sup> *Mississippi v. Johnson*, 4 Wallace 492. William L. Sharkey was governor of Mississippi; Robert J. Walker had been senator from that state 1836-1845, and then (1845-1849) Secretary of the Treasury.

<sup>21</sup> The wife of Charles A. Dunham, *alias* Sanford Conover, had had a similar tale of subornation of perjury against Johnson in respect to the assassination of Lincoln. See Welles, III. 143-146.

not be said that he (Mr. Johnson) had opposed the war; that his action was not based upon any personal hostility toward Mr. Stanton, but upon public considerations of a high character; that as to pending claims, they could be examined and settled by a special commission or referred to Congress; and that it was not his wish to place the general in the attitude of seeking the place now tendered him.

Genl. Grant replied that he would not shrink from the performance of any public duty that might be imposed upon him; but reiterated his opinion as to the impolicy of the proposed removal.<sup>22</sup>

Aug. 5, 1867.

Was instructed by the President to deliver to Mr. Stanton, in person, the letter asking him to resign, the date having been changed to Aug. 5. Called at his room in the War Dept. twice, (not having found him in the first time,) and at about 10.15 A.M. delivered to him the letter. Found him in company with a gentleman, and I therefore merely handed him the letter, and retired.

Aug. 5, 1867. Mrs. Surratt.

The President, having heard that there was a recommendation in favor of Mrs. Surratt, sent today for the papers upon which was endorsed his approval of the finding and sentence of the Military Commission for the trial of the assassination conspirators. Forwarded with the papers was a recommendation of the Court for a commutation of the sentence in the case of Mrs. Surratt from hanging to imprisonment for life. The President very emphatically declared that he had never before seen the recommendation. He was positive that it had never before been brought to his knowledge or notice, and explained to me the circumstances attending the signing of the order to carry into effect the sentence of the commission. He distinctly remembered the great reluctance with which he approved the death warrant of a woman of Mrs. Surratt's age, and that he asked Judge Advocate Genl. Holt, who originally brought to him the papers, many questions, but that nothing whatever was said to him respecting the recommendation of the Commission for clemency in her case. He had been sick, but when he signed the papers his mind was as clear as it had ever been. Besides, the recommendation did not appear in the published proceedings of the trial, by Benn Pitman, prepared and issued by authority of the Secretary of War,<sup>23</sup> and he felt satisfied that it had been designedly withheld from his (the President's) knowledge.

August 6, 1867—Mr. Stanton.

At about 11.45 A.M. Mr. Stanton's reply was received. It was dated the 5th, and will be found in the papers marked "Hon. E. M. Stanton".<sup>24</sup> The President did not evince much, if any surprise, and thought that Mr. Stanton had pursued a course which neither he nor his friends could sustain before the country. He said he would leave Mr. Stanton hanging on the sharp hooks of uncertainty for a few days, and then suspend him from office.

<sup>22</sup> Grant then added a letter, of the same date, the text of which may be seen in Gorham's *Stanton*, II. 394-395.

<sup>23</sup> *The Assassination of President Lincoln and the Trial of the Conspirators*, compiled and arranged by Benn Pitman, recorder of the commission (Cincinnati and New York, 1865). The manner in which the record was presented to the President and in which his signature to the executive order was obtained is discussed in Dewitt's *Assassination of Abraham Lincoln*, pp. 133-137, 283-287; but see also Rhodes, V. 157.

<sup>24</sup> *Trial*, I. 149; Richardson, *Messages*, VI. 584; Gorham, II. 395-396.



Aug. 9, 1867.

The President seems much relieved by the course he has taken in the case of Mr. Stanton, and is satisfied that public opinion will not sanction the position assumed by the Secretary.

Aug. 11, (Sunday), 1867.

The President and Genl. Grant had an interview. The President told the Genl. of his intention to make a change in the War Dept. by suspending Mr. Stanton, remarking that the place thus made vacant must be filled, and the question was, whether it would not be better that the Genl. should be made acting Secretary than that a stranger should be selected for the position. As the Commanding Genl. of the army, he understood the wants and interests of the service, and besides was intimately connected, by the reconstruction acts, with their execution. The President wished to know if Genl. Grant would take the place, if appointed. Genl. Grant replied that he would of course obey orders. The President then said that he thought he had the right to ask if there was any thing between them, (the Genl. and himself). He had heard it intimated that there was, and he would now really like to know how it was. Genl. Grant replied that he knew of nothing personal between them, and then alluded to the difference of opinion between the President and himself respecting the constitutional amendment and the reconstruction acts.<sup>25</sup> The interview here ended, and the President then directed me to bring to him the letter which had already been prepared suspending Mr. Stanton. The President said he was strongly inclined not merely to say "you are hereby *suspended* from office as Sec'y. of War," but "you are hereby suspended and *removed* from office as Sec'y of War."

Before the question was determined, however, Mr. Seward called, and the President accompanied him to church. The President also directed me today to write a communication appointing Genl. Grant Sec. of War ad interim.

Aug. 12, 1867. (Monday.)

Col. Moore, by order of the President, delivered to Mr. Stanton the letter suspending him from office. The Secretary read it, and said, "I will send an answer."

Col. M. then proceeded to Army Head Qrs. and delivered to Genl. Grant the letter appointing him Sec. of War ad interim. He deliberately read it, folded it up, and said "Very well."

About half-past 12 p.m. Genl. Schriver handed to the President Mr. Stanton's reply to the letter suspending him from office.<sup>26</sup>

When the President read the letter to me, he said "the turning point has at last come; the Rubicon is crossed," adding, "You do not know what Mr. Stanton has said and done against me." He then referred to a report prepared at the War Dept. upon a resolution of the House of Reps., in which was embraced a list of murders alleged to have been committed by rebels in the South, not called for by the inquiry, and respecting which the Sec'y had declared that when it was laid before the House the President would be thrust from office without a moment's delay.

<sup>25</sup> Welles, III. 167.

<sup>26</sup> *Trial*, I. 148, 149; Richardson, *Messages*, VI. 383-384.



August 13, 1867.

Speaking of Mr. Stanton and his letter denying the President's authority to suspend him, the President said that Mr. Stanton was one of the most earnest members of the Cabinet in denouncing the constitutionality of the tenure of office act. He was so decided in his expressions that the President, who then had also under consideration the supplemental reconstruction act, requested that Mr. Stanton, Mr. Seward, and Mr. Welles should prepare a veto, as he (Mr. Johnson) had his hands too full to give the subject the attention which it merited.<sup>27</sup> The veto was accordingly prepared, Mr. Seward writing it, Mr. Stanton furnishing the authorities, and Mr. Welles giving some references upon the question which the bill involved. The President and Secretary Welles said that on the occasion referred to, Mr. Stanton, in language as strong as that used by Senator Sherman when the measure was before the Senate, declared that no person of proper sense of honor would remain in the Cabinet when asked to resign. When Mr. Stanton had thus expressed himself, the President said he did his best to cause the Secretary to understand that his resignation would be agreeable. It seemed to be well understood that the bill had been passed for the purpose of retaining Mr. Stanton in President Johnson's Cabinet.

Aug. 14, 1867.

The President to day, in speaking of the Hon. Mr. Groesbeck, of Cincinnati, Ohio,<sup>28</sup> said he was thoroughly familiar with our currency system, and was eminently qualified for the Treasury portfolio.

Aug. 17, 1867.

The President issued an order to day for the removal of Genl. Sheridan as Commander of the 5th District, believing that he was acting in a most arbitrary manner. In sending it to Genl. Grant, he wrote him a sort of personal note, saying that "before you issue instructions to carry into effect the enclosed order, I would be pleased to hear any suggestions you may deem necessary respecting the assignment to which the order refers." The President, in writing the note, said to me that if there were any good reasons against his order, Genl. Grant could call upon him and state them; that he presumed the General would of course oppose the order, as in his letter of the 1st Aug., 1867, he had protested against the proposed removal of Stanton and Sheridan, intimating that the change would produce a revolution.<sup>29</sup> Contrary to the President's expectations, Grant sent a *written* communication, of this date, urgently asking that the order be not insisted on, and which will be found in the package marked "Major Genl. P. H. Sheridan and the 5th Military District."<sup>30</sup>

Aug. 19, 1867.

The President replied to Grant in a forcible letter of this date. The General came over to see the President, and, after a brief conversation, acquiesced in the President's reasons for the change of commanders in the Fifth Military District, expressing the belief that Sheridan, who he said was familiar with the Western country, would do admirably in a

<sup>27</sup> February 26, 1867. Welles, III. 50-51.

<sup>28</sup> William S. Groesbeck, who in the ensuing impeachment trial was counsel for the President.

<sup>29</sup> House Ex. Doc. No. 57, 40 Cong., 2 sess., p. 1.

<sup>30</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 4.

command in the Indian region. He added, however, that it had been rumored that first Sheridan would be removed by the President, then the other district commanders, and finally himself. The President smiled, and reminded the General that long ago he had desired him to act as Sec. of War. The General replied "yes, he did not see the use of a civilian as Sec. of War," and gave the President to understand that after all the removal or suspension of Mr. Stanton was not a bad thing.

In narrating the above, the President said that when the proposition to remove Sheridan was submitted to the Cabinet, Mr. Welles alone favored it—the other—especially Messrs. McCulloch and Browning—appearing absolutely frightened at the very idea.<sup>31</sup>

Aug. 24, 1867.

On the 22d Genl. Grant referred to the President a telegram of the previous day from Surgeon Hasson, saying that Genl. Thomas<sup>32</sup> was in West Virginia, suffering from a disordered liver, and expressing the belief that it would be dangerous for the General to proceed to New Orleans, (to relieve Sheridan,) where the yellow fever was very prevalent. The President thought that this was a favorable indication that Providence was aiding him—his desire, in the first instance, having been to send Hancock to relieve Sheridan, but Thomas having been finally selected, because he was know[n] to be a Radical in his views, and one to whom that party could offer no objection. At the same time, however, he thought that Hancock was the better man of the two for New Orleans—being a splendid looking soldier, of most courteous bearing, firm and decided, and withal of considerable ability. He had not, besides, been mixed up with political matters, and would go to New Orleans unprejudiced.

When, therefore, Grant sent over the Surgeon's certificate and recommended a suspension of the order, the President concluded that it should at once be changed. This he did not do, however, until today, (the 24th,) when he altered the order so as to send Hancock to New Orleans, and leave Thomas, on account of the "unfavorable condition" of his health, in command of the Dept. of the Cumberland.<sup>33</sup>

In speaking of the Cabinet meeting on the previous day, the President remarked that Grant had argued that it would not do to correct the District Commanders in what they did, as such interference must tend to lessen their influence in their commands. He had also actually argued that the commanders of military districts were heads of Depts., in the sense intended in the clause of the Constitution which declares that Congress "may by law vest the appointment of such inferior officers as they think proper in the President alone, in the courts of law, or in the heads of departments."<sup>34</sup>

Aug. 26, 1868.

The President issued today his modified order, retaining Thomas in command of the Dept. of the Cumberland, assigning Hancock to the 5th Military District, and ordering Sheridan to the Dept. of the Missouri. He also ordered that Canby relieve Sickles in the command of the Second Military District.

About three p.m. Aug. 27, the President received from Grant a letter, dated the 26th, protesting against the former's order in reference to the 5th Military District. The General urged—

<sup>31</sup> Welles, III. 149-155.

<sup>32</sup> Major-General George H. Thomas.

<sup>33</sup> *House Ex. Doc. No. 57*, 40 Cong., 2 sess., pp. 6-7.

<sup>34</sup> Welles, III. 182-183, 186-187.

1st. That as Thomas himself had not been heard from directly, there was no present necessity for modifying the order of the 17th, and that unless there were some grave public reasons, no officer should be sent to New Orleans at this time, (on acct. of the prevalence of yellow fever.)

2d. That if Sheridan were immediately withdrawn, there would remain in command no officer of the rank required by law, (Brigadier Genl.) He assumed, therefore, that the President would at least modify his order in this respect.

3d. That the laws devolved upon him (Grant) certain duties, and that he would not consent to yield any of the authority they vested in him, but on the contrary would insist upon its exercise. He admitted the right of the President to assign commanders to the districts, but thought that as he was, under the laws, responsible to a considerable extent for their execution, he should be consulted. He would, however, issue the order necessary to carry out the assignment directed by the President, but must object to the details.

4. That never mind whether the country should judge right or wrong, this act of the President would be interpreted as an effort to defeat the reconstruction measures of Congress. Such a movement, on the part of the President, would only tend to disquiet and financial difficulties, and must lead to the adoption of more stringent measures in regard to the South.

The Genl. concluded by saying that he had sent this communication to the President because he was greatly in earnest.

The President, after having read the above letter in my presence, handed it to me. I read it, and at the request of the President, expressed an opinion as to its contents. The President then pronounced it insubordinate in tone, and said that he hardly believed any answer could be necessary; that if it were even published naked and alone, it would, in the minds of all sensible persons, condemn the author; but that as it was late in the afternoon, he would not determine whether or not he would answer it; early in the morning, however, he would let me know his decision.

Aug. 28, 1867.

The President informed me this morning that he had determined to send for Genl. Grant, and discuss with him kindly, but firmly the positions assumed in the latter's letter. If the result of the interview should not be satisfactory, a written reply could then be prepared. Genl. Grant was accordingly sent for, and in a few moments made his appearance.

The interview did not last very long. To use the President's own words, "After a full and free conference upon the various points of objection raised in Genl. Grant's letter, the General himself proposed to withdraw the communication". The President assenting, the Genl. took the latter with him, and shortly afterwards sent a formal request for permission for its withdrawal, to which the President formally responded.

The President said that in the course of the conversation he told Genl. Grant that the letter could do him (the President) no harm; that he could reply to it as successfully as he had answered his previous communication; and that it would do the Genl. more harm than it would him, (the President). President Johnson reminded Genl. Grant that at the Cabinet meeting the day before he (Grant) had asked to be excused from attending Cabinet sessions, as he did not wish to participate in political discussions, and had requested that he might be sent for when

military matters were to be considered; also that the President had replied that it was entirely a matter of option with the General whether he engaged in such discussions or not. It now seemed (said the President to Genl. Grant) that while the General was making these suggestions, this very letter, which amounted to a sort of political essay, was being copied for his signature at Army Headquarters. The President further suggested that if every order he gave was to provoke a political essay from the General, it would be impossible for the Executive and the head of the War Dept. to work together; that the General must know that there were persons whose interests it would be to create misunderstanding between them; and that he (the President) could not see the force of the General's arguments, especially those that referred to the authority conferred by law upon Grant, when the order itself expressly declared that the District Commanders were to exercise any and all powers conferred upon them by law—none other.

Genl. Grant then asked if he could withdraw the paper, saying that he would issue the order, as instructed by the President. It was accordingly published on the 29th, bearing date the 27th.<sup>35</sup> (See papers marked "Genl. Grant, Genl. Sheridan, and Secretary Stanton.")

Thursday, Nov. 21, 1867.

About 8-1/2 p.m. Col. Cooper<sup>36</sup> came into the Library at the Executive Mansion and told the President that John Morrissey had just been to see him, and had assured him that the House Judiciary Committee had resolved upon a proposition for impeachment, and that the result had been effected by a change of base on the part of Mr. Churchill, of N.Y., a member of the Committee.<sup>37</sup> The President was disposed to doubt the correctness of the information, but remarked that if it was correct, "so let it be." I at once went to make inquiry, and ascertained that Cooper's information was correct.

Friday, Nov. 30, 1867.

Read to the Cabinet the President's annual message, to which there appeared to be no objection.<sup>38</sup> Also, read to the Cabinet his inquiries growing out of the proposition to suspend him during the impeachment trial. The Cabinet unanimously determined that the power of suspension was one that could not be constitutionally exercised.

The President was much gratified, and remarked to me, after the adjournment of the Cabinet, that the day had produced great results. The time for mere defence had now passed, and he could stand on the offensive in behalf of the Constitution and the country.

Genl. Hancock's order, on assuming command of the 5th. Military District,<sup>39</sup> highly gratified the President, who characterized it as manly and statesmanlike.

December 12, 1867.

The Atty. Genl. (Mr. Stanbery) was quite anxious that the President

<sup>35</sup> Welles, III. 188-189. Grant's general order no. 81.

<sup>36</sup> Colonel Edmund Cooper, representative from Tennessee 1866-1867, assistant secretary of the Treasury 1867-1869, and an intimate friend of the President.

<sup>37</sup> John C. Churchill, representative 1867-1871. Welles, III. 238.

<sup>38</sup> Richardson, VI. 558-581.

<sup>39</sup> The celebrated order no. 40, dated November 20, 1867, emphasizing the supremacy of the civil power. See *The Civil Record of Major-General Winfield Scott Hancock during his Administration in Louisiana and Texas*, pp. 4-5, and F. E. Goodrich, *Life of Hancock*, pp. 245-246.

AM. HIST. REV., VOL. XIX.—8.

should at once communicate to the Senate the reasons for the suspension of Mr. Stanton, suggesting that under the tenure of office bill the 20 days began on the assembling of Congress on the 21st of Nov. Mr. Stanbery had prepared a very elaborate paper on the subject, while the President had expressed his views in a brief, dignified history of the case, covering but a few pages. This, the President believed, was all that the question required. Mr. Stanbery, however, thought the case presented an excellent opportunity for the President's vindication, and therefore urged that his paper should be sent to the Senate. To-day the President caused me to read the message prepared by the Attorney General to Messrs. Stanbery, Welles, and Browning, and they discussed at some length the questions it contained.<sup>40</sup>

December 15, 1867.

The President yet thinks his message in Mr. Stanton's case would perhaps have been the best that could have been sent in. He says, however, that several Senators and other persons had told him that the one he had sent to the Senate contained the only explanation they had seen of the New Orleans riot.

He said that he understood from reliable authority that General Grant had considerable feeling about Secy. Stanton's letter yielding to him the War office. It was understood (the President remarked) that before Genl. Grant accepted the ad interim appointment he and Mr. Stanton had a "full and free conference," in which the latter advised the former to take the position. The General, however, seemed to think that in saying "inasmuch as the Genl. commanding the armies of the U. S. has been appointed ad interim, and has notified me that he has accepted the appointment, I have no alternative but to submit to military force." Mr. Stanton conveyed an intimation that he (Grant) was to some extent responsible for the President's action.

In further referring to Genl. Grant, the President observed that at the time of the removal of Sheridan, Grant appeared to have fallen into the idea that a revolution would be the result of such a proceeding; and that when the question was submitted to the Cabinet, Secretary Welles was the only one who sustained the President. Even Atty. Genl. Stanbery opposed the order, saying to the President that Mr. Wilson, the chairman of the House Judiciary Committee,<sup>41</sup> had declared that such a step would lead to impeachment, inasmuch as it would clearly indicate the intention of the Executive to hinder the execution of the reconstruction laws. The President said that when the removal of Sheridan was proposed, Mr. Browning's face actually seemed to grow thin at the suggestion, and that Mr. Randall exhibited nervousness and recommended delay.

The President has prepared a message, suggesting to Congress a vote of thanks to Genl. Hancock for the order issued by him in assuming command of the 5th District, which takes ground for the prevalence of civil law. He has not yet, however, determined to send it to Congress.<sup>42</sup>

Jany. 7, 1868.

I prepared today, by the President's direction, a letter of removal in the case of Mr. Stanton, and also a brief message to the Senate

<sup>40</sup> Richardson, VI. 583-594. Orville H. Browning was Secretary of the Interior.

<sup>41</sup> James F. Wilson, representative from Iowa 1861-1869, one of the managers of the impeachment on behalf of the House, and senator 1883-1895.

<sup>42</sup> Sent to the Senate under date December 18, 1867.

informing that body of the termination of Mr. S.'s connection with the War Dept. by dismissal.<sup>43</sup> The President said he desired to have these papers ready for signature at any moment, as he saw that the Senate were about to take up and act upon the suspension of the Secretary. I referred to the assertion made by some of the journals that Genl. Grant had expressed an intention to transfer the War Office to Mr. Stanton, in case the Senate should decide in the latter's favor. The President answered that Genl. Grant had told him that his action would be limited to withdrawing from the Department and leaving it in the hands of the President as fully as when it was conferred upon him, (the Genl.) The President expressed the opinion that perhaps it would be well for the Senate to reinstate the Secretary, as he could at once be removed, and in the mean time Genl. Grant be gotten rid of; indeed both would thus be disposed of, so far as the War Dept. was concerned. "Grant" (the President remarked) "had served the purpose for which he had been selected, and it was desirable that he should be superseded in the War Office by another."

January 14, 1868.

The President received last evening official notice of the action of the Senate, taken that day, refusing to concur in the suspension of Secy. Stanton. This morning Genl. Comstock, one of Grant's aides, delivered to the President a letter from the General, stating that he had last evening received official notice of the action of the Senate in the case of the suspension of Mr. Stanton, and that under the second section of the tenure of office law, his (Grant's) functions ceased from the time of the receipt by him of the Senate's resolution.<sup>44</sup>

The President exhibited great indignation at what he termed "Grant's duplicity". He said that no later than the preceding Saturday Grant had distinctly told him that if he found he could not, in his own opinion, properly resist the action of the Senate, he would at least leave the office of Sec. of War in the condition in which it was when he had been appointed to the position. This the President declared was not the first time that Genl. Grant had deceived him. In the case of the removal of Gov. Jenkins, of Georgia, by Genl. Meade, noticed in this morning's papers, Grant (the President said) had entirely deceived him, having given him to understand that no such removal would be made.

Genl. Grant attended Cabinet meeting to-day, (the 14th) and the President, in the presence of the Secretaries, referred to the War Dept. matter, asking the General if he did not distinctly tell the President that should the Senate reinstate the Secretary of War, and he (Grant) should not feel himself at liberty to resist such action, he would at least leave the office at the disposal of the President. This, the President said, the General acknowledged before the entire Cabinet, with an abashed look never to be forgotten.<sup>45</sup> Besides (continued the President) Genl. Grant attended the levee last evening, with his wife. Before coming he had received notice of the action of the Senate, and could then have notified me of what he intended to do, and at least have left me the option of making another selection in his place, if I deemed it proper to do so. He then alluded to an assertion that had been made that previous to Genl. Grant's attendance at the levee, the Genl. and Secretary Stanton had had a conference at the former's residence and agreed upon a

<sup>43</sup> The letter (*Trial*, I. 156) was not actually sent until February 21, 1868.

<sup>44</sup> McPherson, *Reconstruction*, p. 283.

<sup>45</sup> Welles, III. 259-262.



course of action, and laughed at the fact that the Radicals had actually legislated Grant, their favorite for the Presidency, out of the War Dept.

January 15, 1868.

Genl. Grant, in company with Gen. Sherman, called early this morning. After the interview closed, the President said to me that Genl. Grant had alluded to an article published in the *Intelligencer* of this morning, and headed "The Stanton affair," and remarked that it contained some things which he (Grant) did not understand to be true. The President replied that he had not yet read the article; and shortly after Grant and Sherman withdrew.

At the President's request, I read to him the article, and he said it was substantially true. Subsequently Secretary Welles came in, and when the subject was mentioned to him, said that he had read the article, and that it was a true statement of the case, so far as it related to what had taken place at the Cabinet meeting. The Secretary added that he was sorry some one had not been "present to take down the exact words, but more especially to paint Grant's confusion of face and manner;" that the General "acknowledged every thing the President said in regard to the understanding between them, and when the conversation was through, slunk away to the door in a manner most humiliating and pitiable."

January 16, 1868.

Secretary McCulloch, in describing the scene at the Cabinet meeting to Atty. Genl. Stanbery, (who was not present on the occasion,) conveyed the same idea as that expressed by Secretary Welles yesterday.

*Jan'y. 17.*—For proceedings of Cabinet on the Grant-Stanton matter see Vol. 4, scrap book, page 77.<sup>46</sup>

January 26, (Sunday) 1868—

The President said he intended to make a new military district, consisting of Maryland, Delaware, Virginia, and West Virginia, and to place Genl. Sherman in command, his headquarters to be in the War Dept., at Washington; that then it was his purpose to make Sherman Sec. of War ad interim.\* He told me that yesterday evening week Genl. Sherman intimated to him that there was not the best of feeling between Mr. Stanton and Genl. Grant; that on the next morning (Sunday, the 19th.) Genl. Grant called at the Executive Mansion prior to going to Richmond, and in the course of conversation spoke of the insignificance to which Mr. Stanton could be reduced in his present position; that he (the President) referred to the law creating the office, and replied yes, that the Secretary would amount to nothing more than a clerk; that General Grant then said that he would not obey Mr. Stanton's orders, unless he knew they emanated from the President; that he (the President) replied that in pursuing such a course the General would do right; that he (the President) did not consider Mr. Stanton as authorized to act as Secretary of War; he had suspended him from office, and did not intend to recognize him.

The President then referred to a letter of Genl. Grant, delivered on the 24th by Genl. Comstock, viz: "I have the honor very respectfully

<sup>46</sup> Doubtless the scrapbook referred to by Welles, III. 262. It is at the Library of Congress.

\* See package marked Genl. Sherman for his letters, declining to take a command at Washington. (*Note in original.*)



to request to have in writing the order which the President gave me verbally on Sunday, the 19th. instant, to disregard the orders of the Hon. E. M. Stanton as Secretary of War, until I know from the President himself that they were his orders."<sup>47</sup>

The President said to me that he did not think he would give the order; that the General had been very restive under Mr. Stanton, had evidently been very glad to get rid of him, had now put him back in the War Dept., and he thought he would let them fight it out. The President also alluded to a letter of Genl. Sherman, dated the 18th., in which that officer, in referring to Genl. Grant, says "he will call on you tomorrow, and offer to go to Mr. Stanton to say, for the good of the service and of the country, he ought to resign." (See papers marked "Genl. Sherman.")

*January 28, 1868.*—See, in the "Correspondence with Genl. Grant growing out of his vacation of the War Department," letter of Jany. 28, 1868, renewing his request of the 24th, and alluding to "gross misrepresentations" "purporting to come from the President," etc., etc.

In the same package of papers, will also be found the President's order upon the subject, dated Jan. 29, 1868, and Genl. Grant's reply dated the succeeding day.

*January 29, 1868,* the President dictated his reply to General Grant's letter of the 28th.

*January 31.*—Genl. Grant's letter of the 28 was today read to the Cabinet. The President then submitted his reply. It was declared to be correct, and met the approval of all the members of the Cabinet present, excepting Mr. Stanbery, who, not having attended the meeting of the 14th, could not of course say any thing with reference to the accuracy of the President's statements. The members present today, in addition to Mr. Stanbery, were Messrs. Seward, Welles, McCulloch, Randall, and Browning.<sup>48</sup>

*February 3, 1868.*—

The correspondence between the President and Genl. Grant was read today to Genl. Sherman. Genl. Sherman corroborated the statement made by Genl. Grant in his letter of the 28th, respecting the conversation which took place on Saturday, the 11th Jany, between the General, Lieut. General, and some members of Grant's staff, in which the latter expressed his views as to his duty under the tenure of office law, and said he would at once see the President upon the subject. Genl. Sherman told the President that Genl. Grant seemed to have made up his mind to await Mr. Stanton's written demand for the office, and then to have referred the subject to the President—thus, as the President held, conclusively showing that the General did contemplate holding on to the office for the President's instructions, and that for some cause or other he suddenly changed his intention. Genl. Sherman further said that Genl. Grant was very much angered at the course of Mr. Stanton, and seemed to have been thwarted in his plans by the action of the Secretary in taking such early possession of the War Office. General Sherman also said that General Grant had told him that Tuesday morning, when Mr. Stanton took possession of the War Dept., the Secretary had sent for him in the usual manner, by an orderly; that Genl. Grant was

<sup>47</sup> *Trial*, I. 240.

<sup>48</sup> Welles, III. 267, 268. The various letters alluded to are in McPherson, pp. 282-286.

indignant against him, declaring that he would never again enter the Dept. while Mr. Stanton was its head, unless sent for; and that Genl. Grant was deeply troubled by the condition which affairs had now assumed, and had become very obstinate in reference to the matter.<sup>49</sup>

February 4, 1868.

Genl. Grant's letter of the 3d, in reply to the President's communication of the 31st, was read to the Cabinet to-day.<sup>50</sup> It evoked expressions both of indignation and ridicule.

Attorney Genl. Stanbery said that aside from the facts in the case, the tone and taste of the letter struck him as most extraordinary.

Secretary Browning. It is the weakest and most disreputable letter that he could have written.

Secretary Welles. He has great ambition, and is a most remorseless man. That was shown in his campaign in Virginia.

Secretary McCulloch. His conversation here was exactly the contrary of what he asserts.

Mr. Secretary Browning. The letter is weak, false, and disreputable.

A suggestion was then made, which met with great unanimity, that an answer should be returned simply stating that the character of the communication was such as to preclude any further correspondence upon the subject. Atty General Stanbery thought that the acknowledgment of the letter should be made by the Private Secretary—not by the President, and in the course of the conversation Mr. Secretary McCulloch stated that General Grant seemed so greatly disturbed at the Cabinet meeting of the 14th. ultimo that it was not surprising that he did not recollect what he had then said.

Secretary Browning. How does he explain why he entered into an explanation as an excuse for not having called on Monday? If he had not promised, there was no necessity for any excuse.

The Attorney General then read the letter, reviewing it, as he proceeded, very severely.

February 5, 1868.

Mr. Stanbery called this morning, and the President caused to be read to him the reply he had prepared to Genl. Grant's letter of the 3d. The Attorney General earnestly urged that as the question was now one of veracity between the President and the General, the members of the Cabinet who were present at the Cabinet meeting of the 14th. ultimo should be called upon for a statement respecting the conversation which then took place. He reminded the President that he (Mr. S.) was an old lawyer, that he had been accustomed to watching cases, and he believed now was the moment to nail this whole affair by doing as he had suggested.<sup>51</sup>

February 6, 1868.

The President today issued an order creating the Military Division of the Atlantic, to be commanded by Lieut. Genl. Sherman, with his headquarters at Washington—the Genl. to assume command as early as may be practicable. The President thought this order would "set some persons to thinking."

<sup>49</sup> Sherman, *Memoirs* (1886), II. 425-428.

<sup>50</sup> Welles, III. 269-270.

<sup>51</sup> This course was taken. Welles, III. 271. The letters are in McPherson, pp. 289-291.

February 7, 1868.

The President, this morning, directed the withdrawal of the above-named order, and it was accordingly returned from Genl. Grant's Headquarters.

February 12th, 1868.

The President to-day renewed the order creating the Division of the Atlantic—omitting, however, the words, "You will direct Lieut. Genl. Sherman to assume command as early as may be practicable."

February 13, 1868.

The President today nominated Sherman "to be General by brevet in the Army of the U.S. for distinguished courage, skill, and ability displayed during the war of the rebellion".

February 15, 1868.

It is said that General Sherman objects to the nomination of General by brevet, as well as to the command of the new Military Division.<sup>52</sup> The President, in referring to the matter, said that when Sherman was in Washington, he conversed with him upon both of these subjects; that the General had expressed in writing his views in regard to the new command; but that when it was proposed to brevet him, he had objected in a way in which a diffident man would hesitate to accept such a distinction.

Monday, Febr'y. 17, 1868.

On Saturday, the 15th, it was suggested to John Potts, the Chief Clerk of the War Dept., that as in case of vacancy the law made him the custodian of all official papers in the Dept., he would be the proper person to be appointed Sec. of War ad interim, until Genl. McClellan or some other suitable person could be nominated to and confirmed by the Senate. The President's idea was to remove Mr. Stanton, appoint John Potts Secretary ad interim, and let him demand the papers, etc. of the War Dept. If Mr. Stanton refused to yield them, then the case was to be brought before the courts. Mr. Potts earnestly desired not to be placed in such a position, urging that he, as Chief Clerk, was the appointee of the Secretary; that if he should go to the Secretary and demand the papers, the Secretary could reply by his removal; that his relations with Mr. Stanton were of a very pleasant nature, and he did not wish to disturb them.

The President remarked this morning that if he could only find a proper person to act as Secretary ad interim, he would settle the War Department question without a moment's delay.

February 18, 1868.

The President entertains some idea of appointing Genl. Thomas, the Adjutant General, Secretary of War ad interim.

February 19, 1868.

The President received through Army Headquarters, this morning, Genl. Sherman's letter of the 14th. He was at a loss to know why the Genl. had not communicated directly with him, and although Sherman in most earnest terms asked to be relieved from the command of the New Military Dept., the President thought he would yet be pleased to come to Washington, remarking that he knew Mrs. S. wished to do so.

The President did not delay long in sending the following telegram:

<sup>52</sup> See *The Sherman Letters*, pp. 300-310.

"To Lt. Genl. Wm. T. Sherman,  
"Saint Louis, Mo.

"I have just recd., with Genl. Grant's endorsement of reference, your letter to me of the 14th. instant. The order to which you refer was made in good faith, and with a view to the best interests of the country and the Service. As, however, your assignment to a new military division seems so objectionable, you will retain your present command.

"ANDREW JOHNSON."

A copy of the above was sent to Genl. Grant for his information.

St. Louis, Feb. 19, 1868.

"To the President:

"Your very kind despatch is at hand. I cannot express under what deep obligations I am for your concession to my wishes.

WM. T. SHERMAN,  
"Lieut. General."

Feb. 19—*continued.*

The President discussed the expediency of making Adj. Genl. Lorenzo Thomas Sec. of War ad interim. He said he was determined to remove Mr. Stanton; that self-respect demanded it; and that if the people did not entertain sufficient respect for their Chief Magistrate to uphold him in such a measure, then he ought to resign.

Feb. 20, 1868.

The War Dept. subject still under consideration in the mind of the President.

Feb. 21, 1868.

The President entered the office promptly this morning, and immediately directed the preparation of the following-named papers:<sup>53</sup>

1st.—The removal of Mr. Stanton and the apptmt. of Lorenzo Thomas, the Adj. General, as Secretary of War ad interim.

2d. A message notifying the Senate of the change.

3d. A request to the Secretary of State to bring with him to Cabinet meeting the nomination of George B. McClellan as Minister to England.

4th. A nomination for the apptmt. of George H. Thomas as a Lieutenant General by brevet, and a General by brevet.

The President sent for Genl. Lorenzo Thomas, and handed him his letter of appointment, and also the removal of Mr. Stanton. He showed Genl. Thomas the laws upon the subject, remarking that he wished to proceed according to the Constitution and the laws, and advised the General to be accompanied by a witness when he delivered to Mr. Stanton the letter of removal. Genl. Thomas said he would take with him Genl. Williams, of the Adj. Genl.'s. Office,<sup>54</sup> and would report the result to the President.

Before one o'clock P. M. Genl. Thomas returned, and reported that he had delivered to Mr. Stanton the President's communication, with the remark, "I am directed by the President to hand you this." Mr. Stanton (said Genl. Thomas) sat on the sofa, and after reading the paper, said, "Do you wish me to vacate at once, or am I to be permitted to stay long enough to remove my property?" "Certainly", I said; "act

<sup>53</sup> The first two are in *Trial*, I. 156.

<sup>54</sup> Major Robert Williams, brevet brigadier-general, assistant adjutant-general. The ensuing narrative agrees with Thomas's testimony, *Trial*, I. 418-419.

your pleasure". I then showed him my order. He said "I wish you to give me a copy." I replied "Certainly, sir." I then returned to my office, a copy of the paper was made by Genl. Townsend,<sup>55</sup> and I certified it as Secretary of War ad interim. When I took it up to him, he said "I want some little time for reflection. I don't know whether I shall obey your orders or resist them."

The Senate was notified by message of the change made in the War Dept. and the nominations of Genl. McClellan and Genl. Thomas<sup>56</sup> were submitted, at the same time, to that honorable body.

February 22, 1868.

Genl. Thomas<sup>57</sup> was arrested at an early hour this morning. He went to the Executive Mansion in company with the Marshal, and then, at the President's suggestion, proceeded to the Atty General for advice. The President said the intention was to give bail and stand trial. Shortly after he sent for the Atty Genl., who came immediately.

Genl. Thomas was released on bail, and after calling at the office of the Atty. Genl., proceeded to the President's House and saw Mr. Johnson, relating to him the proceedings before Judge Cartter. He then went to the War Dept., and was summoned into the presence of Mr. Stanton, who, he said, was surrounded by several members of Congress. The Adjt. General gave the following account of the conversation that ensued: Mr. Stanton remarked that he understood that Genl. Thomas had been issuing orders as Secretary of War ad interim, and he ordered him to desist. Genl. Thomas replied that Mr. Stanton was no longer Secretary of War, but that he (Thomas) was, and would continue to issue orders as such. Mr. Stanton then ordered him to proceed to his own office as Adjt. General. Gen. Thomas positively refused to take any order from Mr. Stanton, and the order and refusal were repeated three times. Mr. Stanton replied "Very well"; then you may stand in the middle of the floor as long as you like. Upon the suggestion of Genl. Thomas, he and Mr. Stanton then went into an adjoining room, where Mr. S. repeated his orders, which the General declined to obey. Genl. Moorhead, a Representative from Pa.,<sup>58</sup> was present, and wrote the orders of the Secretary and the replies of General Thomas. In the course of the conversation, Genl. Thomas told Mr. Stanton that he had caused his (Thomas') arrest before breakfast, and that he had had nothing to eat or drink. Mr. Stanton replied that he thought Genl. Schriver<sup>59</sup> could supply a drink, and thereupon that gentleman produced a small bottle, containing a small drink, which Genl. Thomas took. Mr. Stanton then put his arm around Genl. T.'s neck, and run his fingers through his hair. He also sent to his house for a full bottle, which arriving, they drank together.

Mr. Stanbery and Mr. Welles came to see the President. After an earnest conversation, it was determined, upon the urgent recommendation of the Attorney General, to send to the Senate the name of Thomas Ewing, senior, of Ohio, for Secretary of War. Mr. Stanbery said he

<sup>55</sup> Colonel Edward D. Townsend, brevet major-general.

<sup>56</sup> George H.

<sup>57</sup> Lorenzo; arrested at Stanton's instance. See his testimony, *Trial*, I. 428-429.

<sup>58</sup> James K. Moorhead, representative 1859-1869. See his testimony in *Trial*, I. 170-174.

<sup>59</sup> Edmund Schriver, brevet major-general, in charge of the Inspection Bureau.

was not too old for the place;<sup>60</sup> that he was an able lawyer, an "old line Whig," and an earnest supporter of the President. The President had in the morning suggested Mr. Ewing's apptment. The nomination was prepared and taken to the Senate, but that body had adjourned after a very brief session.<sup>61</sup>

In the House of Reps. there was considerable excitement, and the Committee on Reconstruction presented a resolution of impeachment.

The President says that he has made an issue demanded by his self-respect, and that if he cannot be President in fact, he will not be President in name alone. I have (said he) taken a step which I believe to be right, and I intend to abide by it. I do not want to see this Government relapse into a despotism. I have ever battled for the rights and liberties of the People, and I am now endeavoring to defend them from arbitrary power.

February 23d, 1868 (Sunday.)

A message was prepared today in reply to the Senate resolution denying the power of the President to remove the Secretary of War and appoint a Secretary ad interim. It seems the message is at the instance of some of the Radical Senators, who it is said desire some reasons to justify them in opposing impeachment.

February 24, 1868—(Monday.)

The message above referred to, bearing date the 22d,<sup>62</sup> and the nomination of Mr. Ewing, were submitted to the Senate to-day. A large number of the City Police on duty at the Capitol—there seeming to be an apprehension of some demonstration against Congress. At the Executive Mansion affairs are very quiet.

Senator Doolittle<sup>63</sup> sent to the President this morning, in great haste, a note urging him to send a message to both Houses. The President said he would do nothing of the kind. The message he had prepared was in answer to a resolution of the Senate, and the House had therefore nothing to do with it.

The President, at about 6 P.M. today, received information of the vote on impeachment in the House of Reps.—126 to 47. He received the news very calmly, simply remarking that he thought many of those who had voted for impeachment felt more uneasy as to the position in which they had thus placed themselves than he did as to the situation in which they had put him.

February 25, 1868.

Matters very quiet at the Executive Mansion.

February 26, 1868.

Genl. Lorenzo Thomas was today released—Mr. Stanton declining to prosecute.

It is said that the Committee upon the subject are in "travail" over the articles of impeachment that are to be brought against the President—finding it difficult to agree.

February 28, 1868.

On Monday Genl. Emory,<sup>64</sup> commanding the Department of Wash-

<sup>60</sup> Gov. Thomas Ewing, formerly Secretary of the Treasury, Secretary of the Interior, and senator, was 78 years old at this time.

<sup>61</sup> See Col. Moore's testimony in *Trial*, I. 556-557.

<sup>62</sup> Printed in Richardson, VI. 622-627.

<sup>63</sup> James R. Doolittle of Wisconsin, senator 1857-1869.

<sup>64</sup> Maj.-Gen. William H. Emory.



ington, instructed the officer commanding the garrison of the city to send verbal orders to officers in charge of troops or posts *that all orders must come through proper channels.*

February 29, 1868.

The President, in very earnest terms, referred to the question of impeachment. He said: "They have impeached me for a violation of the Constitution and the laws. Have I not been struggling, ever since I occupied this chair, to uphold the Constitution which they are trampling under foot? I suppose I made Col. Cooper angry with me to-day. He wanted me to use the patronage of my office to prevent a judgment against me by the Senate! I will do nothing of the kind. If acquitted, I will not owe it to bribery. I would rather be convicted than buy acquittal."

Articles of impeachment were today reported from the Committee in the House of Reps.

March 7, 1868.

At seven o'clock P. M. today the Sergeant-at-Arms of the Senate presented to the President the summons to appear before the High Court of Impeachment.

March 8, 1868.

The President said that overtures had been made to Secretary Seward, to the effect that in the event of a change of administration he should be retained in office, provided he did nothing to interfere with the progress of impeachment. Mr. Seward's reply was, "I will see you damned first! The impeachment of the President is the impeachment of his Cabinet."

March 10, 1868.

Mr. Stanbery has determined to resign the office of Attorney General, that he may become one of the President's counsel in the impeachment trial—Unless he resigned, he said that the Radicals would charge that while he was the counsel of the President, he was in the pay of the United States. Besides he wished to devote his whole time and attention to the great work. Afterwards he might resume the office, provided the Senate would permit him to do so.

March 11, 1868.

Mr. Stanbery submitted today his resignation.

March 13, 1868.

The President declares that if his defence is not conducted according to his ideas, he will appear before the Senate in person and defend himself, saying that then, if he should be convicted, he alone could be blamed, if it followed as the result of plain speaking.

March 14, 1868.

The President and his counsel are in consultation. He is informed that since day before yesterday the troops have been under arms, furnished each with forty rounds of cartridges.

Received a rumor, at three o'clock, of the death of Hon. Thad. Stevens.<sup>65</sup> The President did not think it could be true, and compared Mr. Stevens to Vesuvius, which at times withdrew into itself all its heat and vapor, only to burst forth again in flames and lava. So he thought it must be with Mr. Stevens—a sort of temporary paralysis, which would be succeeded by a flow of living passion.

The rumor proved to be without foundation.

<sup>65</sup> Stevens did not die until August 11.



March 16, 1868.

Mr. Stanbery entered the Library this morning in excellent spirits. He said "I am now in regular training, like a prize-fighter. Every morning and evening, I have a man to come and rub me down, to keep in good condition. I feel that we will win, and that you, Mr. President, will come out all right. As the boys say, I feel it in my bones. Don't lose a moment's sleep, Mr. President, but be hopeful. When some things are done, we cannot tell if they be for good or for evil. I confess I felt a misgiving about this act of impeachment when it was first done; but now that it has been done, and the whole matter is to be considered, I see in it nothing but good. It gives you the great opportunity to vindicate yourself, as President, against every charge made against you. It gives you an opportunity to do so not only before the American people, but before the entire world—an opportunity such as you could never otherwise have had, to search and probe every thing connected with your official life—to show whether you are a traitor or not; to show whether or not your policy, when contrasted with theirs, is not the policy of wisdom; to show what would have been the result if it had been carried out, and to bring before the public the results of the course which your political opponents have pursued.

"Why, Mr. President, they call you a traitor to the party which elected you. I am one of that party. When I put the question to myself as to services, I find that I am far behind you in good works; for what did I do? All that I did was without loss or peril, while what *you* have done, has been in the face of all sorts of dangers and difficulties. From the first a Union man, do I feel that you have disappointed me in any hope I had in you? So far from it, if you had taken any other course, I should have been sadly disappointed and grieved. When you succeeded Mr. Lincoln, I said that the danger was that in his death the South had lost its best friend, and that you, stimulated by the injuries you had received from the Southern people, would not deal with them mercifully. That, Mr. President, was my fear, and entertaining this idea, I would not have entered your Administration at the time it was first formed. I came here the succeeding winter. I found you doing your best for reconciliation, and when you called me to Washington, I did not hesitate a moment. I have watched you day and night; I have been with you under all circumstances, and have been consulted by you upon every subject, from the beginning to the end of my connection with your Administration, and I have seen nothing which, had I been in your place, I would not have done myself.

"This impeachment trouble grows out of Mr. Stanton's removal. Let me recall a circumstance. When I came here I found Mr. Stanton in perfect harmony with you. While you were absent on your Western tour, Mr. Stanton and I rode to the Arsenal. We commenced talking about matters, and I said 'The President seems to confide more in you than in Seward.' 'Well' he replied, 'I believe he does.' That was in August, 1866.

"Mr. President, if I can only keep well for this trial, I will be willing to be sick during the balance of my life. I know, sir, that you will come out of it brighter than you have ever shone."

The above is nearly a verbatim report of Mr. Stanbery's remarks, delivered with great earnestness, and considerable rapidity of utterance. He became so impressive and eloquent that, without his knowledge, I seized a pencil, and wrote in short-hand as he proceeded.

The President in referring to the remark made by Mr. Stanbery in respect to Mr. Stanton, said that it recalled to his mind the fact that about the time of the Western trip, Mr. Stanton cautioned him that Mr. Seward was a candidate for the Presidency.

Hon. Alex. H. Stephens, of Georgia, visited the President this morning. The President said that Mr. Stephens actually shed tears as he spoke of impeachment, and remarked "I have served with you in Congress ten years,<sup>66</sup> I have been with you in canvasses, I know you as well as you are known by any man, and now let me counsel you, as I would a brother, to make your own defence. No one can do it as well as yourself, and I believe your safety demands it."

March 17, 1868.

All the counsel are with the President this morning—Messrs. Stanbery, Curtis, Black, Evarts, and Nelson.<sup>67</sup> Mr. Curtis is reading the answer he has prepared to the articles of impeachment.

R. W. Latham<sup>68</sup> called to see the President, but as he was engaged with his counsel, Mr. L. sent for me. He said that last evening he had seen Senator Pomeroy,<sup>69</sup> who had authorized him to say to the President that as matters now stand conviction is a dead certainty, but that the resignation of the entire Cabinet will place him in a position, if he will act promptly—say not later than Thursday—to kill impeachment. Mr. Pomeroy suggests N. P. Banks for the Department of State, Robt. J. Walker for the Treasury—preferring, however, Smythe personally, but Walker, so far as the interests of the country are concerned; F. P. Stanton for the Navy Dept., and submits no names for the Interior and P. O. Depts., though he thinks the present Heads should be removed.<sup>70</sup> Mr. Latham told me that Pomeroy observed to him, "You may say to the President that I don't think he will do this, or take advantage of his position; that he relies more on his enemies than on his friends; that he will in all probability postpone action in these matters until his props are knocked from under him, and then he can do nothing. Did you ever see a blacksmith, who, having his iron heated, hesitated until it cooled? If so, what sort of a weld did it make?"

Mr. Latham continued: "F. P. Stanton and myself had a long talk with Stewart, of Nevada,<sup>71</sup> last night—a sort of caucus in this matter. He is the bitterest man in the Senate; but he said if this thing were done, it would destroy impeachment entirely. He went so far as to say that if he were in the President's place, he would put Butler in one of these offices rather than stand in his present position."

Mr. Latham also said that Senator Pomeroy declared that impeachment was viewed as a *political*, not a *legal* question, and that he would

<sup>66</sup> 1843-1853.

<sup>67</sup> Henry Stanbery, Benjamin R. Curtis, Jeremiah S. Black, William M. Evarts, and Thomas A. R. Nelson. Later Black's place was taken by William S. Groesbeck.

<sup>68</sup> R. W. Latham of New York was at this time president of the Washington, Georgetown, and Alexandria Railroad, with offices in Washington. He appears to have had some political influence in Virginia.

<sup>69</sup> Samuel C. Pomeroy, senator from Kansas 1861-1873.

<sup>70</sup> Nathaniel P. Banks, representative from Massachusetts 1853-1857, 1865-1873, 1875-1877, 1889-1891; Robert J. Walker, of Mississippi, senator 1836-1845, secretary of the Treasury 1845-1849; H. A. Smythe, collector of the port of New York; Frederick P. Stanton of Virginia, representative from Tennessee 1845-1855.

<sup>71</sup> William M. Stewart, senator 1865-1875, 1887-1905.

be compelled to vote for it, unless the President should give him some excuse for a contrary course; that a million of dollars would not save the President as the case at present stood. Mr. L. declared that Pomeroy had said to him, "We are not satisfied with Stanton; we are not satisfied with our position in respect to him. We would be glad to have an excuse to get rid of him in some way, and there must be a general change in the Cabinet before that can be done. The country is not satisfied with Stanton's position, and the President is entitled to have his friends in the Cabinet." The Senator also told Mr. Latham that Secretary McCulloch had himself defeated the President's nominees—Col. Cooper for Asst. Secretary of the Treasury, and Genl. Wisewell<sup>72</sup> as Commr. of Internal Revenue.

Mr. Latham, in conclusion, desired me to remind the President that Banks, Walker, and Stanton were old Democrats, "just like the President," and that they were no more "rabid" than the President to-day.

When I mentioned the above conversation to the President "for what it was worth," he exhibited considerable indignation, remarking "I will have to insult some of these men yet."

During a visit to the Capitol to-day, Senator Reverdy Johnson<sup>73</sup> expressed anxiety that "the President should do something to help himself," and appeared to entertain the opinion that a change should be made in the State and Treasury Depts.

March 18, 1868.

Senator Pomeroy called this morning before ten o'clock, and had a long interview with the President. In referring to the Senator's visit, immediately after he had left the Executive Mansion, the President said that the conversation was of a general character; that the Senator said he had called to see if the President had any suggestions to make; that in reply he (the President) had observed that he had nothing particular to suggest, but would be really pleased to receive the views of Mr. Pomeroy. The Senator (the President said) talked very kindly, and made no recommendation in reference to the Cabinet. He, however, referred to Mr. Seward, remarking that at one time the Secretary was particularly obnoxious to the majority in Congress, but really seemed now to be less so; and that as to Mr. McCulloch, some of Mr. Chase's friends thought that the Secretary was opposed to the Chief Justice, but that the latter deemed Mr. McCulloch his friend. The President replied that in consequence of Mr. McCulloch's timidity, some of his acts had been misconstrued; that he believed the Secretary to be a friend of Mr. Chase; that even his (the President's) motives had been misunderstood; that as he had often declared, the measure of his ambition would be filled if he could perfect the work of reconciliation he had begun; that he was not seeking the Presidency; and that as between Mr. Chase and himself, the only differences that had occurred were mostly those which originated from questions of expediency.

I asked the President if he had sent for Senator Pomeroy. He replied that several persons had urged him to do so, but he had not complied with their suggestions; and that I might therefore infer that the Senator had called of his own accord; that Mr. Pomeroy had spoken in a very friendly manner, and on retiring had said that he would be pleased to receive from the President any suggestions that might tend toward producing a good effect in the present condition of affairs.

<sup>72</sup> Moses N. Wisewell of New Jersey, brevet brigadier-general of volunteers.

<sup>73</sup> Senator from Maryland 1845-1849, 1863-1868.

The President and his counsel are again together this morning, the answer being still under consideration.

The President attended the funeral of Wm. Slade, his Steward, this afternoon, at two o'clock, but the lawyers remained in consultation until 4:30 P. M.

Referring to the Philadelphia Convention<sup>74</sup> to-day, the President remarked that had it received the support of the Democracy, the new party would have been a success, and that he could perceive all along the object of certain party leaders, which was to use him as they would an orange.

March 19, 1868.

The President's counsel again in session. Mr. Groesbeck present to-day, as on yesterday.

March 20, 1868.

The President is not satisfied with the answer to the XIth article<sup>75</sup> prepared by Mr. Evarts. He therefore contemplates bringing before his counsel today his various messages, to show that they contain as strong charges against Congress officially as are made in any of the speeches he has delivered as a private citizen. He is not willing to take back any thing he has said, but expresses himself gratified at the opportunity of once again placing before the people the speeches made during the western tour.

Saturday, March 21, 1868.

The President was engaged with his lawyers today from one o'clock until five. Present, Messrs. Stanbery, Curtis, Evarts, Groesbeck and Nelson: Judge Black absent. As far as I can understand, he has become "miffed" about something that occurred day before yesterday, and has not been present since.<sup>76</sup> About three the counsel were invited into the Library to partake of refreshments. They laughed at the idea that anything could be made of the President's speeches, and did not seem to entertain any doubt of his acquittal.

Sunday, March 22, 1868.

The President's counsel met at 1.30 P.M. and had under consideration the answers to the Xth. and XIth. articles.<sup>77</sup> Present: Messrs. Stanbery, Curtis, Evarts, Groesbeck, and Nelson—Judge Black being again absent. The consultation was prolonged until five o'clock.

The President entertained some idea of appearing before the Senate in person tomorrow. He submitted the question to his lawyers, who were unanimous in the opinion that he should not attend in person.

The trouble between the President and Judge Black grew out of the Alta Vela case. The President seems to think that the Judge attempted to take advantage of the present condition of affairs to press a favorable consideration of that claim. The Judge and his son have recalled their acceptance of an invitation to dine with the President on Friday.

Monday, March 23d, 1868.

Attended the impeachment trial today, as a witness.<sup>78</sup>

<sup>74</sup> The National Union Convention of August 14, 1866.

<sup>75</sup> The article accusing Johnson of declaring the Thirty-Ninth Congress to be no congress, etc.

<sup>76</sup> See *post* p. 128, and Dewitt, *The Impeachment and Trial of Andrew Johnson*, pp. 373-400.

<sup>77</sup> The tenth article related to Johnson's intemperate speeches.

<sup>78</sup> Colonel Moore did not in fact testify until April 3.

March 24, 1868.

Counsel present until 12:25 P.M., when the Cabinet session commenced.

The President explained to me the cause of Judge Black's withdrawal as one of his counsel, remarking, "Because I did not consent to send a vessel of war to Alta Vela to oust one set of Americans in favor of another, and thereby produce a collision with the Dominican Republic, Judge Black refuses to act as my counsel. He has made a pretty record—one which will do him far more injury than it can me."

The President said that there had been some efforts made to heal the breach, and he had been urged by some, who he thought might be in the interest of the Judge, to send for that gentleman. This, the President declared, he would not do. He would rather be put to death than submit to such humiliation.

Wednesday, March 25, 1868.

The counsel again in session at the Executive Mansion.

The veto of the bill to withdraw from the Supreme Court the McCordle case submitted to the Senate.<sup>79</sup>

March 26, 1868.

The President and his counsel have been together all the afternoon. He thinks that after all his trouble with Judge Black may prove a godsend.

Friday, March 27, 1868.

The President discussed the propriety of placing Genl. Hancock in command of the Dept. of the East, or of the new Military Divn. of the Atlantic. He said the command of the latter had been offered to Sherman, a friend of Genl. Grant, and an officer somewhat in sympathy with Congress. Sherman having declined the command, the President thought it would be well now to offer it to Hancock. The difficulty, however, was whether the Head Qrs. should be at Philad., Baltimore, or Washington. There were good reasons, the President said, why they should be at either place—in Philad. because Hancock was a Pennsylvanian and was to relieve Genl. Meade, an officer from that State; at Baltimore, because that city was nearer Washington, and besides would serve somewhat to excite the apprehensions of men who cared not for law, and who were always pretending to fear an invasion from Maryland; at Washington, because ever since Mr. Stanton's removal the President had been kept in ignorance of the military preparations and precautions that had been going on, and he ought to have an officer in command here who could investigate what had been done, and inform him of all that transpired. At any rate (he continued) the order should be issued before Monday, the day set for trial, as its effect might be good.

As to placing Hancock in Meade's place, the President did not seem to care what Meade would think. The President said he had it from excellent authority that at the close of the war, when Grant's success had caused him to be named for the Presidency, Meade had asked the General that, in the event he should be elected to that position, to confer upon him a foreign mission. Meade, when on his way to Georgia, had not found time to call on him, (the President,) and yet he had been informed by the Person to whom he referred that that officer had made it convenient to call on General Grant, and again remind him of his wish to be appointed to a foreign mission, in the event of the General's elevation to the Presidency.

<sup>79</sup> A *habeas corpus* case involving the constitutionality of the reconstruction acts. *Dewitt*, p. 403.

March 27, 1868.

Have prepared an order relieving Hancock from the command of the Fifth Military District and assigning him to the command of the Military Division of the Atlantic.

The President said this morning, in referring to the suggestion that he should make some efforts to influence the impeachment trial: "I had rather be convicted than resort to fraud, corruption, or bribery of any kind—Conviction with a clear conscience is far, far preferable to acquittal, with a knowledge of guilt."

Speaking of Hancock, the President did not know but that after all New York would be the best place for the General's headquarters. There was a great focal power there, and besides he thought it would be consonant with Hancock's wishes. He thought that Hancock deeply felt the slight that Grant had attempted to put upon him in New Orleans, and had shown his manliness by refusing to exhibit the least cringing. "Mentally and physically" (said the President), "they were made in different moulds. General Grant, in the opinion of the people, is not a fair representative of the nation, mentally, morally, or physically. The people should have seen his attitude and looks as he withdrew from the Cabinet meeting the day his duplicity was exposed. The Goddess of History should have been present, to inscribe the scene upon her tablets. It would have shown Gen. Grant in his true colors. Lee will go down in history as a greater man than Grant. Grant was a mere figure-head, who by fortuitous circumstances won a reputation far above his real deserts."

The President told me that he had heard that Judge Black regretted his course in reference to the *Alta Vela* matter.

Saturday, March 28, 1868.

The President is much pleased with Hancock's letter to Governor Pease, of Texas, published in the *Intelligencer* of this morning.<sup>80</sup> Beginning with the Sentence, "When a boy, I remember to have read a speech of Lord Chatham delivered in Parliament," the President read the letter through and commented upon it, saying that it showed that General Hancock was governed by principles with which he had been imbued in youth, which he had not lost sight of, and which he could now bring into play. The letter was a platform upon which he (the President) would be willing to go before the country, and was upon the same line as the General's order upon assuming command of the 5th Military District. In his (the President's) opinion, it indicated more with respect to the principles of our Government than was ever in Genl. Grant's mind.

Informed the President, upon my return from the Capitol, of a rumor that in the High Court of Impeachment the Chief Justice would insist upon it, as a right, to decide questions of law. The President replied that he had been informed that the Justices of the Supreme Court had held a consultation upon the subject, and had concluded that

<sup>80</sup> This letter, dated March 9, 1868, and printed in the *National Intelligencer* of March 28, can be found reprinted in F. E. Goodrich's *Life of Hancock*, pp. 287-299, and in *The Civil Record of Hancock during his Administration in Louisiana and Texas*, pp. 6-14. The civil governor of Texas had urged Hancock to order a military commission for judicial purposes, but Hancock maintained that conditions in Texas were not sufficiently different from those in other states to warrant such a course, and asserted with vigor the propriety of coming back as soon as possible to the ordinary processes of civil justice.



the Chief Justice would have the right to determine all such questions. In this connection the President exhibited to me an anonymous note, written upon delicate, scented paper, in a masculine hand, to the following effect: "Let your counsel move to quash the indictment, the Chief Justice determine in its favor, and close the proceedings of the High Court. It will cause them to terminate to the confusion of your enemies."

Sunday, March 29, 1868.

The President went to hear Father Maguire this morning at St. Patrick's Church, and returned much pleased with the sermon. In the afternoon he refd. to the remarks of the Revd. Father, saying that in his sermon the preacher had alluded to the contest between the aristocracy and the poor. "Now" (said the President) "I don't know anything more depressing than for a man to labor for the people and not be understood. It is enough to sour his very soul. He may have nothing else at heart than the interests of the masses; he may struggle for their elevation; he may have nothing selfish in view, neither his own nor his relations' aggrandizement; and yet he may be deserted by the very persons in whose behalf he has given all that he has. Look at the Gracchi. They were accused of agrarianism; but as I understand it, their idea was to divide the lands that had been conquered, and which had been taken possession of by the nobility, among the people. They fell at the hands of the aristocracy. This American Senate is as corrupt as was then the Roman Senate, and you can place no more dependence in them when the interests of the people are concerned."

March 30, 1868.

The President was again strongly inclined to attend the Senate in person today, and was anxious for the appearance of his counsel. They presently came, and the President, returning to the Library, told me that he had concluded not to go to the Capitol.

March 31, 1868.—(Tuesday)

Cabinet meeting was held today, as usual on Tuesdays. One was also convened this evening, at eight o'clock, upon the request of the counsel.

After the adjournment of the afternoon session of the Cabinet, the President referred to the clause of the Constitution, that "Congress may by law provide for the case of removal, death, resignation, or inability both of the President and Vice President, declaring what officer shall then act as President," etc. He thought the Courts had already determined that a member of Congress was *not* an officer of the Government, and that in the event of his own removal from the Presidency it was doubtful whether Mr. Wade would be eligible for the succession.

April 1, 1868.

An act to exempt certain manufactures from internal taxes and for other purposes was submitted last evening for the President's approval. He signed it, but directly afterwards caused his approval to be erased, and requested me to take the bill to the Secretary of the Treasury and ask his opinion respecting its provisions. I did so; when the Secretary advised the approval of the bill, remarking that it was the first step towards a reduction of taxes, and that although it was only to benefit



a class, and would reduce the revenue, it was estimated, about sixty millions, it contained provisions designed to facilitate the collection of the whiskey tax. Altogether, he thought the President would do well to sign the bill. Mr. Rollins, Commr. of Internal Revenue, who happened to be present, concurred in the Secretary's recommendation. I also consulted Honble. Edmund Cooper, who came to the same conclusion although expressing himself averse to such class legislation.

Saturday, April 4, 1868.

The President, this evening, spoke very freely of Genl. Grant, saying that he seemed to be daily growing guiltier in the public estimation, and that the time would yet come when he would be held in contempt by the people.

The President also refd. to a double-leaded article in the N. Y. Tribune, viz: "We have assurance from Washington that Genl. Grant finds it not inconsistent with his duty as a soldier to announce it as his opinion that the only hope for the peace of the country is the success of the pending impeachment trial. He feels that the national security demands the removal of the President. If the trial should fail, the people can only expect more assumptions of power, and a more determined resistance to law. When the General of our armies entertains this conviction, there is no room for doubt as to the duty of the Senate. The loyal nation demands the President's removal."

"What an idea," said the President, "that the opinion of the General of the army should serve as a guide for the Senate in a matter of impeachment! Is it not another indication that the purpose of the Radicals is a military despotism? What a few years since would have been the fate of the General commanding the military forces if he had done what the Tribune, with such an air of authority, says Genl. Grant has done?" The President was inclined to doubt the accuracy of the Tribune's statement, on the ground that the General could hardly have been so indiscreet as thus to express himself.

Monday, April 6, 1868.

The President divides into three classes those who are now opposing him, viz: 1st. Those who desire his removal because he is an obstacle to their partisan and unconstitutional designs. 2d. Those who, although not widely, if at all differing from him in political opinions, have failed in their efforts to control him, and make him a mere instrument in their hands. 3d. Those who have a grudge against him for the part he took during the war.

April 7, 1868.

The President is very indignant at a letter of "Mac", in the Cincinnati Commercial of the 3d, purporting to give a conversation between the President and himself. It was (the President said) an outrage upon him, and was not a truthful statement of the interview. He repeated what he had said to "Mac" respecting Adj. Genl. Thomas, viz. that the General had made a great mistake, when he first called upon the Secretary of War with an ad interim appointment, in not at once taking possession of the War Dept.; that being of a chivalric disposition, the General had placed too much reliance in what Mr. Stanton had said to him; and that he doubtless felt that he could not, without violence to his gentlemanly feelings, refuse Mr. Stanton's request for time to remove his papers. Genl. Thomas of course felt elated by his

appointment, and had given utterance to remarks which were very indiscreet. The President admitted that he had committed an error in selecting the General, whom, however, he believed to be an honorable, straightforward man.

April 8, 1868.

The President declares that the defence he desires to make in the impeachment trial is for the people—not merely for the Senate, and that he would care nothing for conviction by that body if he stands acquitted by the nation.

## REVIEWS OF BOOKS

### BOOKS OF ANCIENT HISTORY

*Development of Religion and Thought in Ancient Egypt.* Lectures delivered on the Morse Foundation at Union Theological Seminary, by JAMES HENRY BREASTED, Ph.D., Professor of Egyptology and Oriental History, University of Chicago. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1912. Pp. xviii, 379.)

IN this series of lectures Professor Breasted has attempted to reconstruct the historical development of Egyptian religion in its relation to life and thought in a manner made familiar by similar efforts in the field of Hebrew religion. The same principles of textual, literary, and historical criticism are applied. Thus the integrity of the transmitted text is carefully examined, later modifications, interpolations, and additions are looked for, the characteristic tendencies of thought and practice in each period are observed, and the general trend of development is depended upon, to some extent, in the dating of the documents. Such principles and methods may indeed be seen in varying measures in all the works devoted to Egyptian religion, whether by Bunsen, Brugsch, Strauss and Torney, and Budge, or by Eduard Meyer, Erman, Maspero, Naville, Lefébure, Wiedemann, Steindorff, and W. Max Müller. But it may be doubted whether the criticism has ever been so searching and radical, and the reconstruction so comprehensive, within its self-imposed limits, so ingenious, logically consistent, and amply supported by documentary proofs. It is natural that the result should resemble that in Biblical criticism. Some positions need only be stated to carry conviction, even though they be of the nature of scientific conjecture. Such, for instance, are those referring to interpolations in the interest of the Osirian cult. Others leave the reader in doubt as to the legitimacy of what may seem to him too far-reaching conclusions.

Professor Breasted has rendered a real service by basing the most important part of his lectures upon the texts from the fifth and sixth dynasties found at Sakkara, and on what he calls the Coffin Texts, chiefly from the eleventh and twelfth dynasties. The Pyramid Texts, published by Maspero thirty years ago, had not been translated into English. The appearance of an improved edition by Sethe in 1911 gave a more secure basis for translation and discussion, and Professor Breasted's excellent renderings and careful evaluation of much of this material were, therefore, a timely and welcome contribution. The Coffin Texts, more recently published by Lacau, Budge, and Maspero, had only been sporadically discussed; and Professor Breasted's translations and comments are of great value.

No historian will question the close relation Professor Breasted emphasizes between the political and social development and the growth of religious ideas and practices. The stress upon the solar cult is no doubt connected with the first national organization; the rise of scepticism and social discontent may indeed be among the results of the provincial organization in the feudal age; and the later expansion of the empire cannot have been without its influence upon the tendencies toward monotheism.

More evidence may perhaps be needed to substantiate the assumed development of thought concerning the future life and the struggle between a popular Osiris cult, not fathered by strong royal and priestly interests, and the official cult of the state. But the suggestion of a gradual "Osirianization" is as alluring as it is grandiose.

There is no need of an apology for the popular style of these lectures. It is popular in the best sense. Always dignified and worthy of the subject, it sometimes rises to a beauty and eloquence rarely met with in the treatment of Egyptian life and thought by scholars competent to deal with the material at first hand. Professor Breasted is an historian who is able to conjure up the life of a past age and make it live before his audience without losing touch with the recorded facts; and his ability to refer constantly to the great collection of records he has himself made available to men of English speech makes it possible for him to dispense with cumbersome quotations of scattered texts and versions. Occasionally his boundless enthusiasm and his extraordinary gift of vivid presentation lead him to make statements that may seem venturesome to more cautious students. He is a sincere believer in the chronological system elaborated by Eduard Meyer and accepts, as does the Berlin school generally, the conclusions of the great historian as regards both Babylonia and Egypt. Hence very precise dates are assigned to kings of the fourth and the twelfth dynasties, giving what must be feared to be but an illusive appearance of accuracy; the later date of Babylonian civilization is taken for granted, and there are numerous allusions to the priority of the Egyptians. "The moral mandate, indeed, was felt earlier in Egypt than anywhere else" (p. 5); a man born under Sesostri II. lived in "an age when for the first time in history men have awakened to a deep sense of the unworthiness of society" (p. 202); the period 1300-1100 B. C. is the "earliest known age of personal piety in a deep spiritual sense" (p. 6), are only a few of these. In connection with this there is a tendency to trace back to Egyptian influence all sorts of religious ideas. Surely, there is no very close connection between the notion that Ptah thinks before he acts and the philosophical logos-doctrine of Heraclitus, the Stoics, and Philo. It is difficult to see either "prophecy" or "Messianism" in Ipuwer's complaint that Re who once ruled over the people does not show his might as of yore. Much confusion would be saved by limiting the term "Messianic prophecy" to predictions of a coming Messiah. The idea (pp. 246 f.) that Plato may have derived from Egyptian sources the conception of the Suffering Just and the dialogue as a form of literature does not appeal to the

reviewer as plausible. The evidence adduced for the translation "Ascending by Day from the Nether World" (p. 276), and the illuminating discussion of the term "ka" (pp. 52 ff., with which the article by Henri Sottas, *Sphinx*, April, 1913, pp. 33 ff., may now be compared) deserve special mention. There are many phases of Egyptian religion and thought that are not touched upon in this volume; but what it gives is so instructive and thought-provoking that no student of Egyptian history can afford not to read it.

NATHANIEL SCHMIDT.

*Manuel d'Archéologie Préhistorique Celtique et Gallo-Romaine.*

Par JOSEPH DÉCHELETTE, Conservateur du Musée de Roanne, Correspondant de l'Institut. Tome II., Deuxième partie. *Archéologie Celtique ou Protohistorique*. (Paris: Alphonse Picard et Fils. 1913. Pp. viii, 513-910; 160.)

THE successive volumes of Déchelette's *Manuel* are fulfilling the promise of the first. They are all characterized by a wealth of material, presented systematically and lucidly, and discussed with broad and sound scholarship. The most recent installment of the work, the second part of volume II., deals with the early Iron Age, the so-called Hallstatt period. This may be dated, roughly speaking, between 1000 and 500 B. C., and covers an epoch of great importance for the Celtic peoples, with whom M. Déchelette's treatise is chiefly concerned.

It is impossible to summarize here the contents of so extensive a work, or to do more than give a brief indication of its scope and character. In the earlier chapters the author deals with the transition from the Bronze Age and with the beginnings of iron-working in various parts of the ancient world. Next he takes up the early history of the Celts, giving an admirable survey of what is known or believed about their origin, geographical distribution, and different migrations. He shows full acquaintance with the pertinent historical and philological material; indeed, his long foot-note on pages 558 ff. is one of the best compact surveys we have seen of the literature of this subject. Then the author sets forth the main general features of the Hallstatt period and its chronological subdivisions. After these introductory chapters he takes up in detail the archaeology of the age, passing in review all the more important phases of its civilization, its burial sites, villages, fortifications, armor, clothing, and minor objects of use or adornment. Especially full are his accounts of the *tumuli* (geographically classified), the forms of the sword (compared with the types in use in southern Europe), and the vitrified and calcinated walls, the exact purpose and the construction of which are still subjects of dispute. The chapter on bronze vases has particular bearing on the problems of early Greek influence.

This volume, like those which preceded it, represents a great labor of compilation, based upon a vast and rapidly growing archaeological literature, but it is much more than a compilation, and contains in great

measure the results of first-hand observation and individual criticism. The full and systematic survey of the French monuments of the Hallstatt period is in itself a new service, which has not been undertaken before on so large a scale. And the author's expressions of opinion and critical discussions are always of value. Like a number of recent students of various aspects of early and medieval European history, he insists strongly on the study of trade routes and the recognition of commercial, as opposed to ethnological or political, influences. He is thus led to emphasize the evidences of Greek influence on the arts and handicrafts of central and western Europe. Again, he suggests that the famous settlement at La Tène is not an *oppidum* but a post on a well-marked commercial route (p. 563); and, speaking with similar considerations in mind, he opposes the northern localization assigned by d'Arbois de Jubainville to the Ligurians (p. 566). He deals necessarily with many matters about which certainty, or even probability, is hard to attain, and he cannot always take the space to discuss them fully. But he is usually careful to register differences of opinion where they exist. Thus his discussion of the Celtic invasion of the Iberian peninsula as supported by two well-known passages in Herodotus is hardly adequate, but opposing views are set forth in a foot-note. The Celtic migrations to the British Isles are also given insufficient treatment, but these perhaps lay outside the main plan of the book. Still, if one judges M. Déchelette here by the standard which he has set for himself, one is surprised to see him cite the familiar theory of the Celtic origin of *κασιόρεπος* (p. 573) without mentioning the alternative Oriental derivation of the word which has been recently urged. It would be hypercritical, however, to attach importance to occasional omissions like this in a work of such scope and thoroughness.

F. N. ROBINSON.

#### BOOKS OF MEDIEVAL AND MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

*The Evolution of the Monastic Ideal: from the Earliest Times down to the Coming of the Friars.* By HERBERT B. WORKMAN, M.A., D.Litt., Principal of Westminster Training College. (London: Charles H. Kelly. 1913. Pp. xxi, 368.)

PRINCIPAL WORKMAN considers it unnecessary in view of the existing literature to undertake a complete history of Monasticism, yet there are many who would be grateful for such a work from him. They would expect a book of pleasant literary quality, written with the insight due to a union of close criticism and sympathetic *Anempfindung*. They would expect to be furnished a bibliography presented with critical valuations, and notes of minuter discussion and detailed reference useful for investigators. They would expect it to contain the full wealth of recent scholarship, controlled by Mr. Workman's independent accuracy and sound judgment and enriched by his own reflective interpretation.

These merits belong to the work which he devotes to a limited but intensely interesting theme: "the evolution of Monasticism as the expression in concrete life of the central principle of renunciation". What Mr. Workman writes is history, not philosophical analysis, and no historical account of the matter in our literature is more scholarly or more interesting. Yet as he deals with the instinctive evolution of human life when under the control of an isolated instinct, his book has great value for those who seek to know the evolutionary process in the general history of religion. When religion is seen blended in the whole complex of life, the determination of its essence and laws of development is more difficult. More than historians will profit from the reflections of the concluding chapter, reflections which are the scientific result of the historical process here expounded. From this story of the development from isolated Eremitism to socialized Monasticism one might read, a little more distinctly than Mr. Workman has, an immanent instinctive purpose to create a world of the Christian ideal, and the conclusion would suggest a firmer and more unified treatment of the relation of Monasticism to the collectivism of Church and State. But Mr. Workman was not writing a teleological essay.

There are pleasant and informing passages to quote could time be saved from fault-finding. We are troubled by Mr. Workman's misleading use of the term Gnostic when he means not Aeon speculations or redemptive *gnosis*, but simply an ascetic shrinking from the physical and natural. More than Gnostics show that. Why moreover does he speak of the alliance of Monasticism and Orthodoxy as a strange accident? To the historian of dogma it appears psychologically necessary. The heterodox conception of Christ as a mediate being, neither God nor man, was produced for the purpose of scientific explanation. Monasticism, piety, required an object for religious emotion and chose the orthodox doctrine of the God-Man. Governed by emotional thinking, the monk was always monophysite in tendency, either absorbing the humanity in the deity as in Eastern circles, or emphasizing the humanity for his *imitatio Christi* in the practical West.

The reviewer has learned much from the detail of this book, as for example that the friction of Celtic and Roman missionaries in England was chiefly over clan and diocese as contrasted forms of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, or the technical connotation ("unguilded") of *Minores* in Assisi. Much too that one has read elsewhere is given here such luminous meaning and important relations that it is virtually new knowledge. It is a satisfaction to note that the author will publish studies on the decay and dissolution of Monasticism, on Franciscan struggles over corporate property, and on the history of missions.

FRANCIS A. CHRISTIE.



*The Early History of the House of Savoy (1000-1233)*. By C. W. PREVITÉ ORTON, M.A. (Cambridge: The University Press. 1912. Pp. xx, 492.)

DURING the first part of the nineteenth century, when the seven-fold censorship in Piedmont forbade the writing of any history which might refer, even remotely, to contemporary issues, the origins and early expansion of the House of Savoy were favorite topics of investigation. Archives were collected and the appointment of an official historiographer ensured their being put in order. The general revival of interest in medieval civilization touched Piedmontese students also, and they turned their attention to feudal not less than to dynastic concerns. The result was that, by the time that historians could write without restraint, a large body of material had been assembled, and from this material several general histories and many monographs and special studies have been drawn.

The latest of these monographs, by Mr. Previté Orton, of St. John's College, Cambridge, is a fine specimen of minute, patient, and thorough research. He examines the documents of each town or institution, and by the cumulation of the facts thus obtained he impresses the reader with the feeling that the subject is exhausted. This method has the disadvantage at times of seeming to be merely a catalogue of details, which Mr. Orton himself admits are tedious; but any of these details may serve another scholar as the missing link in an important chain of demonstration.

Mr. Orton opens his study with a brief review of the decay of the Burgundian kingdom, on which followed the springing up of several rival families that aspired to the Burgundian possessions. Most important among these, if we measure by later history, were the Humbertines, the founders of the House of Savoy. Humbert Whitehands, count of Aosta (a Burgundian fief), was apparently the earliest leader of the Humbertines, and Mr. Orton narrates how he and his kinsmen, throwing in their lot with the Emperor Conrad, established themselves in French Burgundy before 1040. In 1046 Humbert was Count of Maurienne; whence he bestrode the Alps like a saddle, and could hand on to his successors the two-fold inheritance in France and in Italy. Though Humbert Whitehands is the first distinct personage to emerge in the chronicles of the House of Savoy, the fact that historians have argued plausibly that there must have been *two* Humberts warns us that certainty is not attainable. Mr. Orton, after subjecting this theory to more than thirty pages of searching criticism, concludes by "accepting the view of one Count Humbert Whitehands and one main Humbertine line".

"Critical" is the word which best describes his work from end to end. Thanks to this faculty, he disentangles many of the facts from the legends in which they are embedded—whether these concern the rise of the Ardoinids at Turin, or the fortunes of Humbert's sons and grandsons, or the problem of the two Adelaides (Mr. Orton decides in

favor of one). The marriage of Adelaide, countess of Turin, with Oddo I., count of Savoy, established the family in Piedmont and made obvious for it the "policy of the artichoke", by pursuing which it became under Victor Emanuel II., sovereign of United Italy.

With the marriage of Adelaide's daughter, Bertha, to the Emperor Henry IV. Mr. Orton's story expands into the current of European politics. It deals at considerable length with Henry's quarrel with the papacy and his submission at Canossa; and thenceforth it keeps constantly in view the relations between Savoy-Piedmont and the Empire. Humbert III. allied himself with Frederick Barbarossa, but discreetly held aloof, busied with his own private affairs, during the Emperor's campaign which ended in the disaster at Legnano.

The narrative of these episodes supplies the easiest reading in the volume. But the occasional page or two of generalization and summing up, in which Mr. Orton interprets the significance of medieval life, surpasses the rest in interest, and proves to us that, having mastered his details, he has grasped the whole period. He confirms his statements in abundant foot-notes; adds in an appendix sixteen early documents; and supplies two carefully prepared maps by which the dominions of the House of Savoy are shown in c. 1080 and c. 1189.

WILLIAM ROSCOE THAYER.

*Deutsche Geschichte zur Zeit Maximilians I., 1486-1519.* Von KURT KASER. (Stuttgart and Berlin: J. G. Cotta. 1912. Pp. x, 527.)

THIS is a valuable and scholarly work. Since Heinrich Ulmann published his life of Maximilian I. (1884-1891) no attempt has been made, save in the general histories of Germany, to portray as a whole the period of the reign of the great Hapsburg Emperor. In the intervening years a host of monographs and detailed studies of different events and aspects of the time have been put forth, and our knowledge of it has been greatly increased. It has remained for the author of the volume which lies before us to gather up, arrange, and summarize the results of these special investigations, and thus to enable the general reader of history to keep abreast of the latest developments in this particular field.

The book is essentially, as its title implies, a history of the period of Maximilian, and not a biography in the ordinary sense of the word. Yet so all-pervading, so wonderfully versatile were the imperial mind and character, that there was scarcely an event or a movement of the bewilderingly active and complex time in which he lived, that did not feel, more or less directly, the impress of his personality. Thus a description of the multifarious activities of the German people on the eve of the Reformation, resolves itself, perforce, into a picture of the brilliant, restless career of the monarch who was its titular head. The first two chapters of the book deal with foreign affairs and dynastic

policy, and begin, justifiably, with an account of the Emperor's efforts to raise Germany out of her military helplessness, by organizing her infantry on a national basis, improving its weapons, and otherwise increasing its efficiency. His success in this respect has earned him the title of the Father of the German Landsknecht. If the self-contradictoriness and lack of persistence which characterized his foreign diplomacy prevented his attaining the highest success, and sometimes led him into ridiculous and untenable positions, his dynastic triumphs are undisputed; he is *par excellence* the founder of Hapsburg greatness. Though he carefully avoids dogmatic assertion, the author does not seem entirely to agree with those who hold that Maximilian consistently sacrificed his duty toward his German subjects to his zeal for the aggrandizement of his family. The two were not always reconcilable: often they were diametrically opposed; but it was Maximilian's ideal to advance them both together; and supporting the one by the other, to revive the glories of the medieval Empire through the political supremacy of the House of Hapsburg, while winning new glories for the House of Hapsburg under the protection of the banner of the Empire.

An interesting chapter deals at length with the various attempts at imperial constitutional reform, and the causes of their failure: the last section of it is devoted to a particularly clear and enlightening account of the reception of Roman law in the Empire in the end of the fifteenth century. The reception was of course primarily the work of the jurists and professors of Roman law in the German universities; but the author emphasizes the importance of the reorganization of the Reichskammergericht in 1495 as a factor in carrying a knowledge of its principles throughout the land. Of the three systems of law according to which the Kammergericht rendered judgment, the Roman was bound sooner or later to prevail over and drive out the German and local; and the frequency of appeals, which Maximilian did his best to encourage, carried the process gradually down into the minor courts. The fourth and longest (176 pp.) chapter of the book treats of the "Deutsche Territorialstaat um 1500". Particularly noteworthy is the unusually mild, nay even favorable, judgment, which it passes on the character, aims, and ideals of the average German prince of the time. Differing, as he not seldom does, from Ulmann, who held that the distinguishing trait of the territorial rulers of Maximilian's day was selfishness and absence of solicitude for the common welfare, Kaser maintains that they exhibited, with a few exceptions, a high, almost paternal, sense of duty towards their subjects, great energy in repressing disorder and crime, lively interest in the different economic problems of the day—indeed all those qualities which we usually associate with enlightened despotism. The final chapter discusses economic affairs—especially the causes and preliminary warnings of the Peasant War of 1825—and here perhaps more than anywhere else in the whole book, the author has rendered conspicuous service, in making easily accessible the results of the most recent investigations. Works of this kind do not often emanate from the

pens of German historians, who are pre-eminently writers of monographs and prefer to leave such general history as must be written (even of a limited period) to collaborate enterprise. When, as in the present case, the field is particularly difficult, owing to the multitude and variety of the interests involved, our debt of gratitude is more than usually heavy.

ROGER B. MERRIMAN.

*The Government of the Ottoman Empire in the Time of Suleiman the Magnificent.* By ALBERT HOWE LYBYER, Ph.D., Professor of European History, Oberlin College. [Harvard Historical Studies, vol. XVIII.] (Cambridge: Harvard University Press; London: Henry Frowde; Oxford University Press. 1913. Pp. x, 349.)

THIS monograph, which was awarded the Toppan prize, is a noteworthy contribution to our knowledge of Turkish government. The introduction gives a brief but careful account of the origins of what the author calls "on the whole a durable and useful empire", origins Mohammedan and Christian, Oriental and Occidental, Tatar, Sassanid, Seljuk, and Byzantine; and assigns to the Ottoman Turks the great task of unifying the Mediterranean lands, to the fair success of which "the world probably owes the most of that measure of enlightenment, culture and order which can be found in the Levant today".

The body of the treatise is an exposition in detail of the two composite institutions which unified and governed the Ottoman Empire. To these, Professor Lybyer gives the names "the Ottoman Ruling Institution", and "the Moslem Institution of the Ottoman Empire". The grasp of the individual unity, the parallelism, and the contrast of the two institutions is the author's great original contribution, and here he is clear, convincing, and well documented, as well as illuminating. No future historian of Turkey can fail to take into account this analysis nor these terms.

The Ruling Institution is considered as a slave family, a missionary institution, an educational system, an army, a court, a nobility, and a government. The recruiting of its members from Christian subjects and enemies, their conversion to Mohammedanism, and their training for the duties of war are first explained, then their military duties and organization, their privileged and noble status, their activity as a household and court are described, and finally their direct relations to the government are discussed.

The Moslem Institution of the Ottoman Empire is treated much more briefly than the Ruling Institution, as entering less into the government of the nation. It is considered in its financial, educational, and judicial aspects.

The title of the treatise might suggest a more direct treatment of Suleiman the Magnificent than is given. His reign is taken as the point

of time in which the government of the Ottoman Empire shall be analyzed because it was a reign in which was seen the best fruition of the Turkish government, and also perhaps because we have the fullest material for the study of that period. Practically all that is here written of the Ottoman government applies equally well to several centuries before and after Suleiman. A brief consideration of Suleiman as a legislator, and a list of his viziers are the only personal touches.

Professor Lybyer sees the strongest element of hope for the New Turkey of our day in the democratic spirit of the Ruling Institution. This, he thinks, "gives promise of lighting a new and different torch, which having burned away the limitations and imperfections that caused the ruin of the older institution, will yet be the brighter for preserving a democratic faith in the capacity of an able individual, and a disposition to help him forward by education, and to trust him with all the responsibility he is able to bear".

The treatise is supplemented by a number of valuable appendixes, including three rare documents, namely: "The Second Book of the Affairs of the Turks", translated from an Italian manuscript of 1534; a "Pamphlet of Junis Bey and Alvise Gritti", printed in 1537, presented in the original Italian; and the "Incomplete Table of Contents of the Kanuu-Nameh of Suleiman the Magnificent as arranged by the Mufti Ebu Su'ud", translated from the Turkish. A fourth appendix is a treatise in twenty-five pages by the author of the book, on the Government of the Empire in India, to suggest comparison with that of the Ottoman Empire. The fifth appendix, Bibliographical Notes, is very carefully worked out, and of very great value to any student wishing to work in this field, showing sound criticism as well as full knowledge. It is completed by an alphabetical list of works cited, and a glossary of Turkish words.

Professor Lybyer, like practically all of the Occidental historians of Turkey except von Hammer, is unable to read the Turkish sources. These are of less value than the sources of most national history, for the Turkish writers have had little notion of what was worth recording, and have shown a curious sense of perspective. The historians of Suleiman's time were chroniclers, the Commynes and Froissarts of their day, though with much less of petty and personal detail. They are notable for their omission of accounts of institutions, and of descriptions. Their flowery style often embeds a grain of wheat in a bushel of chaff, and this grain of wheat has generally been carefully gathered by von Hammer and given to us. A few Turkish works have been translated, such as the Kanuu-Namehs, and probably in these is found all the Turkish material needed for this treatise, in addition to such secondary works as von Hammer's, D'Ohsson's, and the immensely useful European records. Nevertheless, the Turkish point of view obtained directly from Turkish books is worth having, and it is undeniable that a perfect equipment for an historian of Turkey would include a reading knowledge of the Turkish language.

Some slight irregularity in the transliteration of Turkish names seems hardly worth noting in face of the exceeding care with which the work has been handled.

Professor Lybber's monograph is scholarly in detail and reference, clear in presentation and organization, and philosophical in its grasp of forces and interpretation of facts.

HESTER DONALDSON JENKINS.

*Geschichte der Jesuiten in den Ländern Deutscher Zunge.* Von BERNHARD DUHR, S.J. Zweiter Band. *Geschichte der Jesuiten in den Ländern Deutscher Zunge in der ersten Hälfte des XVII. Jahrhunderts.* (Freiburg i. B.: Herder. 1913. Pp. xviii, 703; x, 786.)

*Histoire de la Compagnie de Jésus en France, des Origines à la Suppression (1528-1762).* Par le P. HENRI FOUQUERAY, S.J. Tome II. *La Ligue et le Bannissement (1575-1604).* (Paris: Alphonse Picard et Fils. 1913. Pp. viii, 737.)

THE histories of the Jesuits by countries go bravely on. The two thick tomes of Father Duhr's second volume are scarcely at hand before from Father Fouqueray too we have another. But the simultaneous publication accentuates the difference between the two works. In inner content, as in outer form, that difference remains as great as ever; and again it is not alone by its sumptuous print and its pictures that the German work excels.

As in his earlier volume, Father Duhr's sincerity is everywhere as evident as is his scholarship. If he has failed of fairness, it is for no lack of effort. His central theme, of course, is the Thirty Years' War. Whatever his order's relation to that struggle, it was inevitable that the war should color all its activities. That it was the Jesuits' war, however, Father Duhr will not admit. His opening chapter disputes their responsibility for its beginning, and all his book illustrates their eagerness to end it. That certain Jesuits, like Heinrich Wangnereck, fought most fiercely the final settlement he of course concedes; but he shows these to have made themselves the mouthpieces of a Roman policy sharply at variance with that of the order's head, and at cost of rigorous discipline from their superiors. Nor is Father Duhr less frank in laying bare the wide divergence in view and sympathy everywhere to be found among the Jesuits themselves. As to their political activities this is only to reach the result already reached by Moritz Ritter; and much of the argument has been set forth in greater detail in Steinberger's capital study on the Jesuits and the peace question (Freiburg, 1906). But everywhere our author enriches the discussion with new materials—as in his use of the Chigi archives, closed even to Steinberger, but now accessible in the Vatican.

If this be true for political history, much more so is it for the religious



story of his order. What he has to tell of their several provinces and colleges, their personnel, their buildings, their endowments, will interest chiefly his fellow Jesuits; but his story of their methods in school and mission, in pulpit and confessional, at the courts and in the armies, his pictures of the devastation of the war and of the vice, the superstition, and the cruelty that followed in its train, all these will make his book a treasure to the historian of civilization. Even the student of the history of prices will find his profit in the careful tables which here record the cost of Jesuit living. Especially for the story of witch-persecution, which in the Germany of just this period reached its climax, and among the Jesuits found both its hottest supporters and its most eloquent foes, the unflinching pages of Father Duhr have permanent worth. Nor does he forget the services of German Jesuits to science and to literature. But, if he glories in the astronomical achievements of a Scheiner, he does not fail to record the religious narrowness which closed the ears of even a Scheiner to the Copernican views and to point out the "basal error" of the Roman decrees in setting up the Scriptures against science, or to tell us how Scheiner himself was admonished by his superiors to abandon his too free opinions as to the heavens and forbidden to set his name to his treatise on the sun-spots. If in the character and the work of Friedrich Spe he finds the best embodiment of Jesuit ideals and devotes to his biography the closing pages of his volume, he yet frankly reveals to us that Spe's brave book against the witch-hunters made such a scandal in the order that he narrowly escaped severance from its ranks. Such frankness earns, and deserves to earn, our confidence for all his story.

The new volume of Father Fouqueray is, on the other hand, pure partizanship. It knows few lapses into insight, none into impartiality. Yet it is a most industrious compilation, and from sources not all hitherto accessible. The larger share of the Jesuits in affairs of state makes now their story a more stirring one, and there can be no question that the writer's power of narrative grows with the progress of his work. Even his partizanship perhaps makes more intelligible the factional passion of which he writes; and even his partizanship fades when once his order shares the responsibilities of power. The Edict of Nantes, "Since unhappily, by the weakness of the Valois, religious unity was no longer possible", may have been better, he admits, than endless civil war; but "the Church, assured of possessing the entire deposit of Revelation, could only with regret behold her eldest son, the Very Christian King, promulgate ordinances little consonant in themselves with the sovereign rights of the divine truth, authorize without the consent of the Holy See departures from the Canon Law, permit the practice of a dissenting cult, mixed marriages, the opening of unorthodox schools, and recompense ministers and teachers of heresy, which is and will always be error". Yet, now that Henry of Navarre had become a Catholic, our author cannot question his sincerity of purpose, and accepts in literal faith his assurance to his Roman agent that he will "so manage the Edict that the Catholic religion will receive the chief benefit". Were not the Jesuits now his



advisers? "Henry IV., henceforward a sincere Catholic, whatever may be said", had at last come to know them, and henceforward "to his death will love and favor the Company of Jesus"—"with what liberality and what persistence the next volume will relate".

An interesting episode in the present volume is the chapter devoted to the French Jesuits in Scotland under Mary Stuart and her son (1562-1597).

GEORGE L. BURR.

*A History of Geographical Discovery in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries.* By EDWARD HEAWOOD, M.A., Librarian to the Royal Geographic Society. [Cambridge Geographical Series.] (Cambridge: The University Press. 1912. Pp. xii, 475.)

THE author has achieved in an admirable way a very difficult task. During the two centuries under consideration there were many important voyages to all parts of the globe both by land and sea. A number of nations participated in this work of discovery and in particular the Dutch, English, French, and Russian. Land exploration was carried on quite extensively by the Jesuits and other missionaries. To be able to write a book on such a big subject one must possess a very sound knowledge of geography and cartography, not only of the period under discussion but also of those which precede and succeed in order to point out the relation of one to the other. The book shows that the author is well qualified for the work which he undertook. In his introductory chapter he summarizes in a clear and scholarly manner the discoveries of the sixteenth century and states what were the prevailing geographical and cartographical ideas at the end of that period and what were the problems which were handed down to the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. With this as a beginning he proceeds to tell how the different nations went to work to solve these problems. In connection with each important voyage there is a short biographical sketch of the officer in command and a brief discussion of the motives which led to the undertaking. It is well known that during the greater part of the seventeenth century the purpose of the voyages was largely commercial development, towards the end of that century geographical knowledge was advanced through the exploits of the buccaneers, but from about the middle of the eighteenth century, generally speaking, the aim of the voyages was primarily scientific discovery and only incidentally trade.

According to the author, "the most notable achievements during the first half of our period were the voyages of Tasman, which did more than any others to draw the veil from the previously unknown Australasian area. . . . Glancing now at the regional extension of exploring work during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, it may be said that the most marked characteristic of the whole period was the unveiling of the great Pacific Ocean."

Taking into consideration the long period covered and the numerous

voyages studied it is only natural that the book should be packed full of facts. Its style is narrative from beginning to end. It is not altogether easy reading and very few will read the book through for pleasure. The author avoids controversies; he contents himself with stating the facts and very little more, and, under the circumstances, he could hardly be expected to do otherwise. In many cases he made use of the sources, but since there is such a vast amount of original material written in so many different languages, the author was of necessity compelled to fall back on the best available secondary authorities. One who has made a special study of one of the many topics in the book will be somewhat dissatisfied with the author's treatment of it, yet it must be admitted that he did the best he could with the secondary material at his command. It is rather strange that the voyages of Mogami Tokunai, the Japanese geographer, in the North Pacific during the years 1785 and 1786 (the date of the third is not known) have been overlooked. The value of the book would have been greatly enhanced if a list of the best books on the subject were given.

One of the features of the book is the very full index. Of the 475 pages about four hundred are text and fifty index. There are about sixty illustrations, many of them reproductions of old maps, and most of the others are likenesses, in the main, of Englishmen interested in navigation. The author is fair and impartial in his treatment of all discoveries and discoverers, no matter under what flag they sailed.

The book is valuable as a work of reference; its statements may be accepted because they are based on the best available authorities.

F. A. GOLDER.

*Stolen Waters: a Page in the Conquest of Ulster.* By T. M. HEALY, M.P. (London, New York, Bombay, and Calcutta: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1913. Pp. x, 492.)

MR. TIMOTHY HEALY'S *Stolen Waters* is hardly a history. It is the restatement of a great law argument against the right of an Englishman to monopolize the valuable fisheries in the waters of Lough Neagh, the largest lake in the British Islands, and to charge rent on what has been freely enjoyed by the people of the surrounding counties from time immemorial. The alleged right is based on grants made under the great seal of Ireland to Sir Arthur Chichester in the reign of James I., taken back by Charles I. at the instance of Strafford, and restored by Charles II. Mr. Healy, who was retained on the side of the people in the final argument of the case, when it was decided for the Earl of Shaftesbury by a vote of four Conservative judges to three Liberals, pleads for a re-opening on the ground that the judges were but partly informed as to the facts, and gave little or no weight to considerations of the first importance. He contends, and seems to show, that the grants to Chichester, then lord deputy at the head of the Irish government, were fraudulent from the first, were kept secret from the govern-

ment in London, and were formally renounced even before Strafford was made aware of their character. The renewal to his son at the Restoration was secured by grossly false statements made to the king. In both operations the forms of both English and Irish law for the protection of rights in land and in fisheries were ignored.

The original grants included all the fisheries in the Bann River, as well as Lough Neagh, through which it flows. It was through the promise of the Bann fisheries, which were known to be of great value, that the London Companies were induced by King James to put their capital into the colonization of Londonderry and Tyrone, and thus save the new settlements from the weakness and poverty which had frustrated so many plantations. And while Deputy Chichester was pretending to the king to be laboring for the success of the Londoners' undertaking, which James had much at heart, he was plotting to strip them of the most valuable asset they were expecting from the royal hand.

The general estimate of Chichester has been that he was an honorable and upright man. Mr. Healy gives this praise to his predecessor, the Earl of Devonshire, but pronounces Chichester the ablest and the worst of the Englishmen who labored for the subjugation of Ireland to the British yoke. He thus deposes Strafford from that place, and indeed furnishes a vindication of many of the proceedings for which that deputy has been judged cruel and tyrannical, especially his search into the kind of title by which many English and Scottish settlers held their lands. And beside Chichester he pillories Sir John Davies the attorney-general, and James Hamilton, afterwards Lord Claneboye, who both have been regarded as exceptions to the cruel indifference with which the native Irish were treated in that period.

Our author gives his authorities for every charge he brings, often at great length, and with the profuseness which suits a legal brief rather than a history. His order of discussion also is that of the lawyer rather than of the historian; and the hammer-like blows with which he clenches his statements are wearying to a reader not as much absorbed as himself in the subject. But those who have the patience to keep up with his argument, will come to the conclusion that Mr. Healy is fighting against a great injustice, and will get many new lights on the Tudor and Stuart period of Irish history. Especially clear is the story of how the O'Neills were driven from Ulster, not by the strong hand of soldiers like Devonshire, but by the chicanery of English lawyers like Davies, and thus left that most Irish of provinces open to "plantation". But "the Flight of the Earls", as it is called, is not a heroic chapter, and needs more apology than Mr. Healy is able to offer.

ROBERT ELLIS THOMPSON.

*Life of Sir Henry Vane the Younger, Statesman and Mystic (1613-1662)*. By JOHN WILLCOCK, M.A., D.D., F. R. Hist. Soc. (London: The Saint Catherine Press. 1913. Pp. xxi, 405.)

It is high time for some one to write a good biography of Sir Henry Vane the Younger. Of the five principal lives which have so far appeared, that of Sikes, written immediately after Vane's execution, is little more than a contemporary panegyric; the work of Upham and even that of Forster have long been out of date; Hosmer's book, whatever its quality, is twenty-five years old; and Ireland's is rather popular than scholarly. Since Hosmer wrote the boundaries of our knowledge of the period in which Vane lived have been much enlarged and what probably remains the best account of the subject of Mr. Willcock's book has been written for the *Dictionary of National Biography* by Professor Firth. Besides the great contribution of the latter to the history of the closing years of the Interregnum, not a few studies and monographs on special phases of the revolutionary period have illuminated dark corners and amplified our knowledge. It might be expected therefore that Mr. Willcock would produce what we have so long and vainly desired, a summary of what is already known, the clearing up of many obscure points in Vane's career, and an informing estimate of his character and place in history in an attractive and well-ordered narrative. For this the present author has certain large qualifications. His biographies of the eighth and ninth Earls of Argyll revealed at once a very considerable knowledge of the period and much skill in presentation. Equally good on the historical and on the literary side they roused hopes of similar excellence in the treatment of a character and a career more complex even than those of the Argylls.

It cannot be fairly said that these hopes are fully satisfied by the present work, however great an advance it marks, in certain particulars, over its predecessors. To say that it is, perhaps, the best of Vane's longer biographies is not very high praise, and we may well believe it is far from the last word. To begin with, the ground is evidently less familiar to the author than that of his preceding work, the touch is less sure, the dependence on secondary authority greater, the picture neither so clearly drawn nor so convincing. Many incidents in Vane's career are doubtless extremely obscure. Even so simple a matter, apparently, as that important side of his life, his education, at Westminster, at Oxford and on the Continent, remains almost as cloudy as ever. Some light, indeed, is shed upon the incident of Vane's connection with the fall of Strafford, but, with all Mr. Willcock's attempts at interpretation, that light seems, on the whole, too favorable. One would be glad to have the point of the negotiations with the Elector Palatine in 1644 cleared up, if that were possible; and, not to make the list too long, the reasons why Vane was executed and Lambert was not, might well have been elaborated here. Moreover a fuller knowledge of more recent monographic work, especially that by Professor Notestein on the Com-

mittee of Both Kingdoms, would have helped the account of that institution, and of Vane's share in it, in these pages. Concerning other points an honest difference of opinion may well exist. To call Vane and Argyll "daring spirits" is from one point of view true enough, but not from that of many of their contemporaries—to whom "subtle" seemed far more euphemistically appropriate. There can scarcely be much mystery (pp. 96-97) as to why the attack on Strafford was altered from impeachment to attainder, and as to the king's being powerless to keep his pledge to the great earl, that opinion rests too largely on what one thinks he might have done. What Mr. Willcock has added to our knowledge he has himself noted in his preface and it is not inconsiderable. Nowhere is there so full a statement of the relations of Vane and Cromwell; and there is fresh light on Vane's career after the Protector's death and his connection with the Willis plot. Perhaps the views of Vane's character and career are not too favorable, but they are certainly favorable enough. He was, of all men of his time, the exemplar of the doctrine that "it is the business of a dissenter to dissent", yet he was in many ways the ablest administrator of his day, at once the subtlest and most adroit of managers in political manipulation and the most advanced of political theorists. Out of these contradictory qualities it is not easy to construct a finished or a satisfactory portrait. So mystical as to be esteemed a fanatic; so practical as to wield the greatest power with the most eminent ability and success; so subtle and astute as to be judged often crafty and untrustworthy, reckoned at once courageous and timid, hated in life and honored at his death, the portrayal of such a man seems difficult to the point of impossibility. Yet one feels in laying down the present volume that, had the treatment been less impersonal, had there been more of Vane and less of a summary of events, had the subject been kept more continually in the foreground, more clearly individualized and at the same time more concretely identified with those things of which he was so great a part, the result would have been more satisfactory. As it is, Vane often seems in these pages as elusive as he appeared to many of his contemporaries. This, with the unqualified acceptance of the worst possible view of Charles I., the almost casual treatment of foreign, especially French, affairs, notably the characterization of Mazarin, the Fronde, and Cromwell's relations with Condé and the Huguenots, and their like, give the book at times an air of superficiality which tends to obscure its better qualities and its not inconsiderable real value.

W. C. ABBOTT.

*Lord Chatham and the Whig Opposition.* By D. A. WINSTANLEY, M.A., Fellow and Lecturer, Trinity College, Cambridge. (Cambridge: University Press. 1912. Pp. ix, 460.)

MR. WINSTANLEY has again delved courageously into the tangled politics of eighteenth-century England, continuing his study of that familiar conflict between the idea of party government, engendered by

the Revolution, and the revival of the royal power under George III. Obviously enough the gradual shaping of constitutional changes appears less significant to the actors themselves than it does to the scholar of a later day with all his advantage of perspective; and one is strongly tempted to believe, in spite of Mr. Winstanley, that the Rockingham Whigs were bound together not so much by principles of any sort as by the common belief that, being all more or less distasteful to the king, they could storm his closet successfully only by preserving a semblance of unity. It was more the logic of the spoilsman than the reasoning of conscious "constitutional pioneers". Wanting in both solidarity and self-sufficiency, and too opportunist to present any definite opinion on public questions, they could not otherwise than fail when pitted against a single commander whose vision was as clear as his views were precise. To George III. at least the issue was always clean cut. Fixed in his determination that party government should never become an integral element in the nation's polity, he strove consistently for the right to select his own ministers, until for a time, as Mr. Winstanley puts it, "the Revolution was nullified".

The book naturally treats also of Chatham's anomalous position in the constitutional struggle, and sheds interesting light upon his tragic ministry. It must be admitted that our author does not, like Ruville, attempt to explain Chatham's equivocal rôle while Townshend was, so to speak, stacking the cards; although the Chatham papers attest amply to his knowledge of the situation. But the author's researches do convict Chatham of gross ingratitude toward Grafton. After bullying that devoted satellite into accepting the Treasury and persuading him, in spite of all, to retain it, he did not scruple later to enter opposition, when Grafton's only fault had been the compulsion to act (as best he knew how) without Chatham's advice. That he was unwilling to accept failure when his health was breaking may have been due rather to the state of his mentality than to a misconceived sense of duty; but it has been well shown by Ruville that Chatham was as loath to take the responsibility of grappling with the colonial problem as he was unable to solve it; and the reviewer suggests that his refusal to accept office back in June, 1765, was actuated not so much by the need of an adherent in the Treasury, as Mr. Winstanley believes, as by the reasonable hope that the Rockinghams would sufficiently dispose of the colonial issue to ensure a lull during which he (the ultimate contributor to their destruction) might rise upon their ruins, and once more devote his talents to the service of the state.

Not the least interesting chapter in the book is that devoted to the king's successful intrigue to disrupt the Opposition in the summer of 1767. It is interesting also to mark this as the one occasion when the colonial issue loomed up into sufficient prominence to make a coalition of parties impossible. As Mr. Winstanley now shows us, it was Grenville's sturdy adherence to his principles that contributed more than anything else to make the king's tactics successful.



A word of praise, in conclusion, is due the author's estimates of public men. Though he sometimes needlessly repeats himself, his judgment of his characters is wonderfully well balanced, and even Townshend's behavior receives a measure of justification.

T. W. RIKER.

*History and Historians in the Nineteenth Century.* By G. P. GOOCH.  
(London, New York, Bombay, and Calcutta: Longmans, Green,  
and Company. 1913. Pp. 600.)

"THE object of this work", says the author in his preface, "is to summarize and assess the manifold achievements of historical research and production during the last hundred years, to portray the masters of the craft, to trace the development of scientific method, to measure the political, religious and racial influences that have contributed to the making of celebrated books, and to analyze their effect on the life and thought of their time. No such survey has been attempted in any language." The comment of any student of history who reads this work through is that this object has been achieved; henceforth there is such a survey. It is a contribution to literature as well as to history. Such a gallery of portraits is not often presented from the ateliers of serious scholarship. There is swift and telling characterization, life, and movement. The figures of the great historians "hold"; they are interpretative and real. The judgment upon their work is sane and either bears the marks of a conscientious study of the evidence or reviews with discriminating insight the judgments of more special and competent critics. One has but to compare such a volume as this with the compilations at present upon the reference shelves of our libraries to realize what a valuable contribution it is. Let us hope that the comparison will be possible in any library before very long.

After an introductory chapter in which is hurriedly traced the rise of modern historiography—from a sermon to a science, the volume opens with Niebuhr, "the first commanding figure in modern historiography". This is the first of a series of eight chapters tracing the development of history in Germany; through Wolf, Böckh, Otfried Müller, Eichhorn, and Savigny, the brothers Grimm, the *Monumenta Germaniae Historica*, Ranke, Ranke's critics and pupils, and finally the Prussian school. Then follow six more on France, six on England, one on the United States, and separate surveys of minor countries, Rome, Greece, the Ancient East, Jewish and Church History, Catholicism, and the History of Civilization. It is a comprehensive plan, and in the six hundred pages there is little waste space in carrying it out. Critical reference is made in all to some six hundred historians, of whom many receive comment in more than one place.

The book justifies the labor which the author has put upon it, and one recognizes throughout the essential qualities of scholarship. Indeed it is much the type of book which one might have looked for from



Lord Acton, impressive in scope and finished in workmanship. It is therefore not one of those where the reviewer's business is to pick out small details of oversight or technical blunders. So far as the writer knows, the best sources and best guides have been used, and used with independence and self-restraint. To be sure there are many places where no satisfactory guide exists, especially in the matter of recent biography. *Éloges* and magazine articles are often rather thin, but not less often they are the best we have. And yet the weak point of the book is just here, in the mechanism for reference. One should perhaps not look such a good gift in the foot-notes; but the fact remains that the student of history, for whom the book was obviously written, will often turn away, disappointed that he has no further guidance. While the foot-notes are well chosen and helpful, and the references uniformly bear the date of publication, the aim has been apparently to keep them at a minimum and to offer them only for the major works. One realizes how much more could have been done in this line when one turns to such a fine survey as Eduard Fueter's *Geschichte der Neueren Historiographie*, which, by the way, is hardly a rival, since it covers the whole modern period and omits contemporary history. Fueter's minor references are often hardly more than bibliographical notes. This makes them still highly valuable; all that one misses in their compression is the comment of the author. Mr. Gooch, on the other hand, generally contents himself, in such cases, with the passing comment, often characterizing works of high importance in their own field, yet not of general interest, by allusions which are useful only to the reader who knows already what they are about. Who, for instance, but a specialist in church history is likely to make much out of the statement (p. 547), that "The most sensational of recent additions to knowledge is Stein's discovery of Manichean documents in Turkestan", which is the only remark upon this matter? It may seem sufficient to an Englishman to remark (p. 400) that "the transition between the England of the eighteenth and the nineteenth centuries has been lit up by the writings of Mr. and Mrs. Webb", but how much more useful it would have been to have stated in as many words the relation between the *History of Trade Unionism* and the *Industrial Democracy*. It may seem trivial to insist upon the initials of names—which are never given in the notes—and yet what thesis of the *École des Chartes* was ever passed with such careless references?

In the difficult matter of proportion every reader will be his own judge, but it seems questionable policy to analyze the volumes of a Masson one by one, giving in all over twenty pages to historians of Napoleon, and to dismiss Holland Rose with one line. Moreover, it is at the close of chapters or sections where evidently the problem of space was uppermost in the author's mind, that one comes upon the hurried references by allusion, running as high as fifteen to a paragraph. Yet the volume remains an impressive contribution to the history of historiography, and, as we said above, it seems ungracious to ask more of it.

Perhaps if it had had a perfected mechanism it would not have shown the gift of style.

J. T. SHOTWELL.

*The Franco-Prussian War and its Hidden Causes.* By ÉMILE OLLIVIER. Translated from the French with an introduction and notes by GEORGE BURNHAM IVES. (Boston: Little, Brown, and Company. 1912. Pp. xxxvii, 520.)

A QUERY addressed by Mr. Ives to M. Ollivier (as to the possibility of extracting from the latter's voluminous history of the Second Empire the story of the Hohenzollern candidacy for the throne of Spain and of the negotiations that immediately preceded the Franco-Prussian War) led the ex-premier to make up the book which Mr. Ives has translated. By adding notes and appendixes, drawn in part from the author's larger work, in part from other sources, the translator has made himself virtually editor. His labors have greatly increased the usefulness of the volume, for in many instances he gives us parallel and variant accounts of the same episodes, and, in the later appendixes, he reprints some important documents.

The title of the book arouses expectations that are not fulfilled. M. Ollivier reveals no causes of the Franco-Prussian War other than those that have been known for many years. For the period which the volume covers in detail—the first half of the month of July, 1870—his narrative is a primary source; but the points in which it varies from the narratives previously published are of minor consequence. The interest of the book, both to author and to reader, lies in the interpretation of the facts. M. Ollivier's theses may be stated as follows: (1) that he was not personally responsible, either by act or by omission, for the outbreak of the war; (2) that the French government was not responsible; (3) that the war was deliberately forced upon France by Bismarck; and (4) that it was an unnecessary war. The order in which these theses are here stated fairly represents their relative importance in M. Ollivier's mind, as indicated by the amount of space he has devoted to each. It seems desirable, however, to examine them in the reverse order.

It may doubtless be shown that few wars would have been fought if the nations and governments concerned had acted rationally. It is probable that the Franco-Prussian War could have been avoided if the majority of the French people had shared M. Ollivier's view that German unity was a German question, that France could not claim "revenge for Sadowa", and that a united Germany constituted no menace to French interests. It is, however, a notorious fact, which M. Ollivier corroborates, that the majority of the French people—the majority, at least, of those Frenchmen who made themselves audible—felt very differently. It is equally notorious that few Germans believed German unity attainable without a French war. Given this state of mind on either side of the Rhine, and behind it the memories of centuries of conflict, and it

seems hardly conceivable that war should not have broken out, either in 1870 or soon after.

It is really not so much the causes as the occasions of the war of 1870 to which M. Ollivier devotes chief attention.

That the renewal of the Hohenzollern candidacy for the throne of Spain in 1870 was Bismarck's work and was calculated to provoke French hostility; that the withdrawal of the candidacy crossed his plans; that the form in which he published King William's refusal of guarantees, creating as it did the impression of a more abrupt and definitive breach than had really occurred, and placing the French government in a position from which it could not retreat without loss of prestige, practically brought on the war—all this is now generally admitted by German historians. From these facts, however, it does not follow, as Ollivier maintains, that Bismarck was solely responsible for the war. Nothing that Bismarck did would have made war inevitable if the French had not been in a belligerent frame of mind. When the matter was laid before the Chamber, Thiers—who, as Ollivier justly remarks, had done as much as any one man to create in France feelings hostile to Germany—said that France was “going to war on a question of sensitiveness”.

What Bismarck really did was to force in 1870 a war which Napoleon was preparing for 1871. In 1869 Napoleon had conducted direct negotiations with the Emperor of Austria and the King of Italy for an alliance against Prussia. In May and June, 1870, French and Austrian experts elaborated plans for an 1871 campaign against Prussia. “The fact”, Ollivier tells us (p. 89), “that no formal treaty of alliance had been concluded proves that the war took us by surprise *and was not premeditated by us.*” Down to the clause which the reviewer has italicized, the statement is true and illuminating, but the final clause leaves one gasping. Ollivier of course attempts (except in one passage, presently to be noted) to minimize the importance of these negotiations. Of the military consultations he tells us nothing. Mr. Ives gives us a foot-note on the subject (p. 39), but does not furnish adequate references to the sources and literature.

Ollivier's defense of the French government is hampered by his prime purpose, that of self-defense. In clearing his own skirts he leaves those of the emperor and of other Frenchmen entangled. Thus, in endeavoring to show that he did not accept the chances of war lightly or inconsiderately, he tells us that the letters of Emperor Francis Joseph and King Victor Emmanuel indicated the existence of a “moral alliance” (p. 89). Of the demand for guarantees, framed by Napoleon and Gramont without his knowledge, he says that it “could be interpreted only as a purpose to bring on war” (pp. 224, 225). And when he appealed to the ex-emperor, through Prince Napoleon, for protection against Bonapartist attempts to make him the sole scapegoat, he obtained the following authoritative résumé of the situation: “If I had not wanted the war, I would have dismissed my ministers; if the opposition had come from them, they would have resigned; finally, if the Chamber had been forced

into the enterprise against its will, it could have voted against it" (p. 363, note 1).

That Ollivier should not be held responsible for the war is fairly clear. The proof of his guiltlessness, however, is not to be found solely in the examination of his acts and omissions during the critical first two weeks of July. The really conclusive proof is to be read between the lines of his book, and it is the more convincing because he gives it unintentionally. He shows us everywhere that neither his official position nor his force of character enabled him to make war or keep the peace. Premier in an ostensibly parliamentary government, he was in fact only a figure-head. The emperor had reserved the direct control of foreign affairs (pp. 83 *et seq.*). During Ollivier's entire term of office diplomatic negotiations were carried on by Napoleon personally. It was not until July 6, 1870, that the premier heard anything of the 1869 negotiations for alliances; it was not until 1875 that he heard of the military consultations held in 1870 (p. 39, note 1). Finally, as we have seen, Napoleon and Gramont framed, on July 12, the fatal demand for guaranties, without consulting Ollivier or the other ministers (p. 218). The emperor similarly kept in his hands the control of the army. The minister of war did not report to the council, but directly to the emperor (pp. 83, 84). Ollivier had to depend on Napoleon's assurances as regarded alliances, and on Le Bœuf's assurances as regarded the condition of the army. The expectations that were then aroused he cannot yet regard as illusory; witness his pathetic attempt to show how the French armies might have triumphed, if— (pp. 395, 396).

Ollivier's mental lucidity at critical moments, his independence of outside influences, and his force of character are certified to us by Ollivier himself (pp. 51, 52). To the reviewer this paragraph seems the most significant in the volume; and it is interesting to read, in connection with it, Ollivier's censure of Benedetti's self-esteem (pp. 133, 134). Had Ollivier possessed the qualities he ascribed to himself, he might perhaps have exercised, despite his disadvantageous political position, a dominant influence upon the movements of events. His own narrative, however, does not exhibit these qualities in decisive action. We see the light of his intelligence focused on words rather than things, and more on the way of saying things than on the substance of the things said. We see his course determined by a number of extraneous influences: the vacillations of the emperor, the actions of his colleagues, the opinions of diplomatists, the remarks of deputies, the utterances of the journals. This, of course, he did not see at the time, nor does he see it now. Like Faust in the Walpurgisnacht he thought himself impelling when he was impelled.

MUNROE SMITH.

## BOOKS OF AMERICAN HISTORY

*The Economic History of the United States.* By ERNEST LUDLOW BOGART, Ph.D., Professor of Economics, University of Illinois. Second edition. (New York, London, Bombay, and Calcutta: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1912. Pp. xvi, 597.)

THE appearance of a new edition of this book calls attention again to the neglect of our economic history by American economists. The first edition appeared six years ago and, excepting the brief and elementary work of Miss Coman, was the only book in its field. It remains to-day in undisturbed possession. The new edition is an improvement upon the first in many particulars. Several subjects very inadequately treated or omitted altogether in the first edition have been more satisfactorily dealt with. Three new chapters have been added: one on Neutrality and Foreign Trade, another on Population and Labor before the Civil War, and a third on Conservation. The chapter on Currency and Banking before the Civil War has been entirely rewritten and is also practically new. In addition to these there are numerous changes in the text all through the volume, many of which involve the rewriting of a paragraph or the insertion of a new one amounting often to a complete modification of the views previously expressed by the author on important subjects. He has evidently made a diligent effort to incorporate into this new edition the results of all studies that have been published since the first edition appeared or that were overlooked in it. These changes have greatly improved the book, but they are not extensive enough to justify the statement that it "may almost be regarded as new". Its plan remains what it was before and its general character has not been changed.

According to the author's view the economic history of the United States is the story of the achievements of a virile, energetic people devoting themselves to the exploitation of rich natural resources, untrammelled by custom, tradition, or political limitations. In telling this story his plan is to trace "the growth of industry [manufactures], agriculture, commerce, transportation, population and labor from the simple, isolated agricultural communities of the colonies to the complex industrial and commercial society of to-day". Each of these topics is dealt with in one or more chapters in the four periods into which he divides our economic history: first, Colonial Development, secondly, the Struggle for Commercial and Economic Independence 1763-1808, thirdly, the Industrial Revolution and Westward Movement 1808-1860, and fourthly, Economic Integration and Industrial Organization 1860-1912. Nearly one-half of the volume is devoted to the last period. Considering the vast field to be covered in the limits of a single volume of less than six hundred pages, the author has been fairly successful in carrying out his plan. There are few important subjects that have not been at least touched upon and he has used all

the best books and secondary material concerning them. There is little evidence of independent investigation of sources where secondary material does not exist or is inadequate for an account. He has brought together into a digest the available information concerning all these subjects and aimed to furnish an explanation of the more important phases of development. This has required an immense amount of careful study and constitutes a service of no small value.

It is easy to point out defects in the book. The most obvious ones arise from the attempt to deal with too many subjects in the space allowed. The result is a narrative which is loose and scrappy, with little reasoned continuity. The important subjects and big events are not made to stand out prominently so as to make clear their significance. It is impossible in a paragraph or two to deal effectively with the African slave-trade so as to show its enormous importance to the whole economy of colonization. An account of the slave system which developed from the spread of cotton culture which fails to consider at length the economic effect upon the South and upon the nation as a whole, must be regarded as very unsatisfactory. Few subjects are of greater importance and interest than the significance of railway construction and railway management in our economic life. Here is the industry in which the development of the corporation may best be traced and where that striking figure in American society, the great captain of industry, first appeared. Here also competition as the regulator of economic affairs first failed, and gave rise to the characteristic economic problem of our time, government regulation of industry. These aspects of the subject are entirely ignored. Still more surprising is the failure to give a good discussion of the influence of the protective tariff policy upon the growth of manufactures, or to consider in the chapters on labor the problems which grew out of emancipation. Another defect is the absence of foot-notes giving specific references for statements of fact and expressions of opinion. It ought to be possible in a book of this kind to see at a glance the sources from which the author has drawn his facts and ideas. The selected list of authorities at the end of each chapter is not sufficiently definite.

GUY S. CALLENDER.

*Publications of the Colonial Society of Massachusetts.* Volume II.  
*Collections: Massachusetts Royal Commissions, 1681-1774.* (Boston: The Society. 1913. Pp. xxxvi, 409.)

THE Colonial Society has finally brought to a successful termination the first part of a plan formed many years ago to print the extant royal commissions and instructions issued to certain of the crown officials of Massachusetts during the period from 1681 to 1774. The first volume containing the commissions is now before us and the second, which will contain the royal instructions issued during the same period, is already provided for. With the completion of this work an undertaking of first



importance will have been finished, constituting not only the most important publication of this active society, but the first presentation in print of a complete series, as far as obtainable, of the commissions and instructions issued to a royal governor in any of the colonies. We can only wish that an effort of this kind would arouse the state of Massachusetts to atone for a long and not very creditable neglect by printing its colonial records for the period after 1686. It stands now with the state of South Carolina as the only two of the thirteen original colonies that have failed to fulfil this duty to themselves and to colonial history.

The present volume contains fifty-four commissions. The recipients were the president of the council for New England, the governor, lieutenant governor, and secretary and register of the Dominion of New England, the governors, lieutenant governors, and secretaries of the Province of Massachusetts Bay, the governors as vice-admirals, the collector, surveyor, and searcher of customs in the colonies of New England (1681), and the Bishop of London (1727, 1728). In an appendix are printed translations of such of the vice-admiralty commissions as are in Latin and of the commissions to the bishop which are also in Latin. Prefacing the chief documents are a table of regnal years and the provincial charters of 1691 and 1725.

The documents are printed with the utmost care and accuracy from copies obtained partly in London and partly in Massachusetts. Mr. Matthews, the editor, tells us that though "diligent search has been made in London and elsewhere" he has been unable to find copies of five of the lieutenant governors' commissions, those of Addington, Stoughton, Tailer (first and second), and Dummer (first). It is unfortunate that the search was not extended more widely, for the commissions of April 7, 1711, and April 28, 1715, to Tailer and that of July 28, 1716, to Dummer are extant and readily accessible. He further says that the commissions to Andrew Oliver (1770) and Thomas Oliver (1774), though found in the Massachusetts archives, are not among the Colonial Office Papers. He is again mistaken; both the commissions are recorded in the Plantation General entry-books. His apparent surprise that these lieutenant governors' commissions are not entered on the Patent Rolls betrays an unfamiliarity with the fact that such instruments were issued under the royal sign manual and not under the great seal, and therefore were never enrolled.

As an important test of a work of this kind is accuracy of reference, an error or two may be noted. On page 90, the form "Patent Roll, 1 Anne, 3424, No. 8", confuses two references: "Patent Roll, 3424", the key number used in calling out the roll, and "Patent Roll, 1 Anne, Part I, 8", the reference to the place of the commission on the rolls. Similar mistakes are made on pages 347 and 353. On page 136, "Part 2" should be "Part III", and on page 396, "Part I" is omitted from the reference, which should read "Patent Roll, 14 William III, Part I, No. 2".

CHARLES M. ANDREWS.



*The Life and Letters of John Paul Jones.* By Mrs. REGINALD DE KOVEN. In two volumes. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1913. Pp. xvi, 478; vii, 513.)

OF the eleven biographies of Jones, the one recently published by Mrs. De Koven is the most detailed and extensive, and is based on the widest research. The author has expended much time and money in gathering materials in various depositories both in this country and in Europe. She has examined, either personally or by means of agents, the manuscripts relating to her subject in the archives of the United States, Great Britain, France, and Russia, those in the libraries of Harvard University, of Boston and New York cities, of the Pennsylvania and New York historical societies, of the American Philosophical Society, and of the British Museum, and those in the private collections of J. P. Morgan, Grenville Kane, John Boyd Thatcher, William K. Bixby, James Barnes, and Charles T. Harbeck (I. x; II. 485-486). An inspection of the list of sources of information, to be found at the end of volume II. (pp. 485-490), indicates that she has examined most, if not all, of the printed materials bearing on her subject. After so exhaustive a research, future students of Jones cannot expect to make important discoveries.

The large net cast by Mrs. De Koven has resulted in some interesting finds, which add to the details of our knowledge of Jones, but which do not essentially change the general outline or general estimate of his career. This was inevitable since Jones preserved his papers from 1776 until his death with much care, and most of them have been used by earlier biographers. Perhaps mention should be made of some new materials for the period before 1776 discovered by the author, and of her rather novel treatment of Jones's life in France and Russia. She has also, I am told, discovered two new miniatures of the commodore. The book is well printed and illustrated. Several of the illustrations are published for the first time. There is a map showing Jones's cruise in the *Bon Homme Richard*, and one showing the engagement of the Russian fleet under his command. The appendix contains reprints of several important documents, a note on the replica of the Houdon bust, and an account of the finding of Jones's body by General Porter. For her industry in making so laborious a research, Mrs. De Koven deserves much praise. Her frequent quotations, especially those from unpublished materials, will be found exceedingly useful.

Turning now to the treatment of materials, one is compelled to speak with less praise. Of two essential qualifications of a good biographer, a sympathetic imagination and judicial detachment, the author appears to possess only the first, and that somewhat in excess. Indeed, her sympathy for her subject is so strong that she is in a measure incapacitated for the task that she has assigned herself. All biographers write their own biography as well as that of their subject, and Mrs. De Koven is no exception to the rule. The assertion that we have in this book a feminine characterization of Jones might be regarded as susceptible of

defense had not the existence of distinctive masculine and feminine qualities been disputed by some recent philosophers—chiefly women. It is certainly true that one sex does not readily understand the psychology of the other. Perhaps we may discover in this thought the cause of some of the limitations in the work of Mrs. De Koven, and of the fact that she finds it more easy to admire than to explain her subject.

The (1) interpretative and the (2) probative or controversial parts of the book are most open to criticism. The interpretation of an historical character varies of course with the interpreter. English writers conceiving of Jones as a rebellious British subject obtain one view of him. American writers, including Mrs. De Koven, conceiving of him as an American citizen who fought gallantly for his country obtain quite a different view. One may also conceive of him as an adventurer, a cosmopolite, a free lance, who was not especially particular on what field he fought so long as it promised glory. There is a large element of truth in Jones's words to the Countess of Selkirk (although we must not take these words or any words of Jones too seriously): "I am not in arms as an American . . . I profess myself a citizen of the world, totally unfettered by the mean distinctions of Climate or of Country, which diminish the benevolence of the Heart and set bounds to Philanthropy" (I. 314-315).

The author rather glosses over, as it seems to me, Jones's weaknesses—his vanity, his quarrelsome disposition, his excessive sentimentality, and his ardent self-love masking itself behind phrases of disinterestedness and expressing itself in an almost habitual tone of injury and disappointment. She does more than justice to his conspicuous virtues, to his professional achievements, and to the touch of genius which he possessed. I cannot agree with her that Jones died of a broken heart, that he was "thwarted in life", and that, according to the "persistent sequence of his fortunes" he received "disappointment and blame instead of rewards for hard-earned victories" (II. 43-44, 433). On the contrary it seems to me that Jones made a phenomenal success of his life, and that it is largely for this reason that his career possesses an abiding interest. One cannot follow the author in her complete assurance that if her hero had had larger opportunities he would have won greater fame. It is true he might have won greater fame, but quite as often as otherwise fate shows her partiality for her favorites by limiting their opportunities.

The probative parts of the book are in the main unsatisfactory and reveal the author as quite unpractised in the handling of historical evidence. She fails to organize her evidence, she draws improper conclusions from it, and she forces it to yield much more than it is capable of yielding. Having established a probability or a possibility, she proceeds to reason as if she had established a certainty. She overweights the value of Jones's statements regarding himself, quite forgetting that men, especially men with the temperament of Jones, do not view themselves impartially and are unable to tell the whole truth respecting themselves.

She has failed to recognize that hearsay evidence arising subsequent to the death of a celebrity must be viewed with suspicion and handled with care, and is never to be put on an equality with first-hand contemporary evidence. She is weak in historical perspective, and gives too much weight to facts supporting her own views and prepossessions—a defect common to most historical writers.

A few of the points in respect to which the reviewer differs from the author will be indicated. He cannot accept the view that Jones in referring to himself as a "son of fortune" (I. 37) confessed that he was a pirate. He cannot accept Samuel Chase's narrative (I. 37-43) at its face value, because of its origin and the internal evidence that it contains of inaccuracy. The phrase "solitarily enough" which is found in the original of Reed's letter but not in the quotation (I. 54) is somewhat inconsistent with the phrase "gayeties and distractions" (p. 60) in Mrs. De Koven's description. Further evidence is desired identifying "The Grove" of Reed's letter with "The Grove" of the North Carolina family of Jones. Something more is needed to prove that he adopted the name of this family (I. 63), and that his association with it was the "critical period in his history" and caused a "truly remarkable metamorphosis" (I. 64) in his character. If the author's conclusions are true it is certainly remarkable that Jones never mentioned this family in his letters, and that he preserved no letters to or from its members. The statement by Reed in a letter to Jones that Miss Dandridge had married Patrick Henry is not conclusive proof that this lady was in love with Jones (I. 78-79). The marine committee did not wish to put Jones at the head of the navy (I. 151). That Jones's use of the words, "It had not been his intention to attract Lord Selkirk's notice by his history or otherwise" (I. 299), supports the view that Jones believed that Lord Selkirk was his father is another illustration of the fantastic reasoning of the author. The flimsy evidence upon which she impugns the chastity of Jones's mother and makes his uncle his father may serve to circulate a slander but is quite insufficient to establish a truth (I. 298-307). One wishes better proof than is given that Franklin "deliberately sequestered" an important document respecting Captain Landais (II. 95). Certain admissions of that officer may or may not be "typical illustrations of the incomplete control of the conscious mind over the subconscious desires" (II. 104-105). The author's deduction from Franklin's statement quoted on page 99, volume II., is proved to be wrong by Franklin's statement on page 111 of the same volume. On one page the statement that Barney knew how to appreciate the eccentricities of Jones is accepted, while on the previous page it appears to be rejected (II. 238, 239). Possibly the most amazing of all these curious reasonings is one which is thought sufficient to prove that Jones was the father of a son and intended to marry the child's mother (II. 279-280); but it is equally amazing that a biographer who discovers in her hero a "lofty idealism and rare disinterestedness" (II. 430) permits him to abandon both mother and child and to pursue elsewhere his sentimental diversions.

The style of writing is as a rule simple and clear, but occasionally it is neither. Several slips of statement and a few other indications of carelessness were noted. One cannot say that the author has realized her desire to present a "final and truthful estimate" of Jones's life and character (I. xii). There is still needed a briefer and more critical biography of this officer and a well-edited edition of his most important correspondence.

C. O. PAULLIN.

*An Economic Interpretation of the Constitution of the United States.* By CHARLES A. BEARD, Associate Professor of Politics, Columbia University. (New York: The Macmillan Company. 1913. Pp. vii, 330.)

PROFESSOR BEARD states frankly that this study of the Federal Constitution is fragmentary, but his reason for its publication is the hope of influencing others to turn their attention from "barren political history" to the more fruitful field of economic "forces which condition great movements in politics". With this purpose most students will sympathize and turn hastily to the succeeding pages.

Here one finds an interesting chapter on historical interpretation in the United States in which our schools of history are classified and compared to similar schools in Europe. Then follows an analysis of the economic forces and groups in the thirteen disunited states of 1787. These economic groups are the "disfranchised", the "real property holders", and the "personal property interests". Thus the method of the work is distinctly foreshadowed. The movement for the Constitution, Property Safeguards in the Election of Delegates, and Economic Interests of the Members of the Convention are the titles of other important chapters. The distinct contribution of the work is chapter V. in which the personal and financial interests of all the "framers" are given with much detail. To know who dealt in securities in 1787 to 1789 and what the economic bearings of the propositions which came before the convention were is very important, for our generation wants to know the "connections" of its public men.

But the remaining chapters are also informing—those which treat of political doctrines of 1787 and the process of ratification, which shows the purposes of powerful men of that day. Two things, however, escape Professor Beard's search—two apparently minor points on which light might be given: why was Franklin defeated in his campaign for the Pennsylvania ratifying convention and why did Washington decline to "stand" for the Virginia convention? Stone and McMaster say that Franklin was a candidate of the opposition party in his state. We know he was to have been put forward originally as president of the convention of 1787, but that Robert Morris and the banker group deserted him for Washington at the critical moment. And we know also from McRee's *Life and Correspondence of James Iredell* (II. 223) that Washing-

ton was considered for a while as a candidate before the voters of Fairfax for the Virginia convention but that he withdrew. Was there a "deal" before the meeting of the Philadelphia convention between low-country Virginians and the Philadelphia bankers whereby the discussion was to be guided into safe and sane paths? These are questions which frequently arise when one consults the contemporary sources. It may not be possible to answer them.

It remains to say that this "fragment" of a book is exceedingly stimulating, that this use of the mass of Treasury manuscripts to which the author has had access has whetted the appetite for other studies of this kind and given rise to the hope that we shall one day understand the political philosophy of the makers of our national Constitution and be able at the same time to appreciate the hostility of a majority of the people of that period to both the "Fathers" and their Constitution. Without entering here upon that interesting question of historical method and interpretation it can be said that the author has certainly succeeded beyond the promises of his preface. He has looked beneath the surface of things and brought to light many new facts, or old facts long overlooked.

WILLIAM E. DODD.

*The Cotton Manufacturing Industry of the United States.* By MELVIN THOMAS COPELAND, Ph.D., Instructor in Commercial Organization, Harvard University. [Harvard Economic Studies, vol. VIII.] (Cambridge: Harvard University. 1912. Pp. xii, 415.)

STRICTLY speaking, Dr. Copeland's book is not an historical work. There is a short chapter which deals with the growth of cotton manufacturing before 1860 and here and there in the volume short excursions are made into the history of the industry, but, in the main, the work is descriptive in character and is intended to acquaint the reader with the present status of the American cotton industry and to afford a comparison between the American and European methods of manufacturing and organization. The subjects dealt with are the geographical distribution of the factories, the technique of cotton manufacturing, labor conditions and wages, specialization and consolidation, marketing conditions, and the export and import trade in cotton goods.

One of the important conclusions reached by the author is that the Southern States have little, if any, permanent advantage over New England for the manufacture of cotton goods. The advantage which they have hitherto enjoyed is that of cheap labor but in the South the supplies of cheap labor no longer respond to the demand and neither the negro nor the immigrant seems to be attracted to the cotton mills. Henceforth it is probable that the New England manufacture will grow as rapidly as that in the South.

A comparison of American with English conditions leads to the con-

clusion that Lancashire has certain advantages due to cheaper fuel, more favorable climatic conditions, more highly skilled operatives, and the easy accessibility of repair shops and by-industries. The Continental manufacturers appear to have no such advantages over their American competitors. Such advantages as the English possess pertain chiefly to the finer grades of goods. The more highly remunerated labor in American mills has led to a greater use of machinery to reduce the cost of that labor. When the greater efficiency of the American operative, equipped with such machinery, is taken into consideration America seems to be at no disadvantage so far as labor costs are concerned. "I have no hesitation", says Dr. Copeland, "in asserting that higher wages are one of the least of the obstacles which stand in the way of American cotton manufacturers in international competition." The better organization of the American mills and the standardization of production also count in favor of the Americans. Such information as the author gives on labor conditions, especially on wages and trade unions, is, however, rather scant and any comparison of labor costs in the several countries is fraught with difficulties.

Dr. Copeland's account of associations and combinations in the cotton industry shows that consolidation has not made much progress and, except in one instance—the manufacture of sewing thread—it has been attended with slight success. Monopoly is particularly difficult in this field and such economies as have been secured through combination have been economies in the selling rather than in the manufacturing side of the industry. The author points to the possibility of further integration for the attainment of this end.

In his treatment of the tariff Dr. Copeland adopts no uncertain tone. One might almost venture the criticism that the author had here forsaken the rôle of investigator and had assumed that of the advocate, were it not for the fact that it is now pretty generally admitted outside of manufacturing circles that the import duties on cotton goods are almost useless as a means of affording protection to the classes of cotton goods mostly manufactured in this country. The secrecy involved in the manipulation of the cotton goods schedule as well as that of the woollen goods and the complexity of these schedules have brought these tariffs into disrepute.

Dr. Copeland thinks that as American manufacturers come to develop the export trade in cotton goods they will themselves ask for a repeal of the duties and also seek a repeal of the duties on cotton machinery. The best chance for a development of a foreign market he sees in Canada and he thinks that in return for this market the manufacturer might well afford to surrender his cherished protection. Good possibilities for a trade in American cotton goods exist also in China and in South America but the trade with these countries demands the development of an efficient distributive system which at present is lacking there.

The volume is well written and its author has undoubtedly made a thorough investigation of his subject. The book deserves to rank with



Professor Sidney J. Chapman's *The Lancashire Cotton Industry* as a careful analysis of a great modern industry.

M. B. HAMMOND.

#### MINOR NOTICES

*The Dominican Order and Convocation: a Study of the Growth of Representation in the Church during the Thirteenth Century.* By Ernest Barker, M.A. (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1913, pp. 83.) Mr. Barker's little book is not merely, as its title implies, a contribution to ecclesiastical history, though it is that certainly. It is also a suggestion as to the origin of the idea of representation in the history of the English Parliament. The origin of the idea Mr. Barker finds in certain practices of the Dominicans, begun almost immediately after their organization and first copied, as seems probable, in the English church in 1226 and afterwards adopted in the organization of Convocation. He also traces a possible line of influence of these ideas upon public men, like Stephen Langton and Simon de Montfort, and thinks that through them the idea may possibly have been applied in the first beginnings of political representation. That representation may have originated in the Church and been borrowed by the State is not a new suggestion. What Mr. Barker has done is to show in specific cases how it began and was developed in the Church, and how it may have passed over to the State. The book is an important contribution to the constitutional history of the thirteenth century thoroughly and cautiously worked out. When the history of the representative system is finally written, a clear distinction must be made between the origin of the idea on one side, and on the other the existing institutional forms which were taken hold of to carry the idea out. This distinction Mr. Barker has overlooked as may be seen in his note on Stubbs on page 53. Stubbs has in mind the institutional origins throughout his account, and these, the jury, the assemblies to report on the sheriffs, the use of the knights in taxation, etc., must all be carefully studied. In the account of the case of 1254, the suggestion as to the earlier institutional forms employed in sending up the county delegations in my *Origin of the English Constitution* (pp. 320-324) is not referred to. Whether that suggestion will finally stand the test of criticism or not, the evidence for it is such that it must be taken into account upon the institutional side. Professor A. B. White's detailed working out in this REVIEW for October, 1911, of the explanation of the assembly of 1213 briefly proposed in note 70, page 53, has also escaped the author's notice. In its attitude towards parallel Continental institutions, the book is a sign of a new epoch, as is especially the sentence: "We have learned of late not to contrast English with continental feudalism, but to see in both the same plant growing under somewhat different conditions" (p. 76).

G. B. ADAMS.



*Francesco Petrarca and the Revolution of Cola di Rienzo.* By Mario Emilio Cosenza, Ph.D., Instructor in Latin in the College of the City of New York. (Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1913, pp. xiv, 330.) The title of this book is misleading. The reader expects to find an historical study, and, instead, discovers that Dr. Cosenza is only continuing the commendable task, commenced in his *Petrarch's Letters to Classical Authors*, of familiarizing English readers with the correspondence of the humanist poet. A translation of the few letters addressed or relative to the unfortunate political idealist of medieval Rome, takes up half of the book; the other half is devoted to illustrative material in the form of the introductions and notes to these letters. The work of translating has been correctly done: a certain stiffness and laboriousness of style apes fittingly the artificiality and the rhetorical devices, the classical reminiscences of Petrarch's Latin works. The notes are timely and informing, and the author often supplements and corrects those in Fracassetti's edition and translation of Petrarch's letters. The author shows himself well qualified to elucidate the many allusions in his text to Latin literature and Roman history.

On the other hand, in the historical sketch, which serves as a framework to the translation and notes, Dr. Cosenza shows that he is unequal to his task. His slight acquaintance with this period of history, including the episode which interests him, does not fit him to set in its right perspective the relations of Petrarch and Cola di Rienzo, however limited in scope and personal those relations may seem. He only uses the obvious authorities on the subject of his book, without considering their different critical value, and some of the most important of the authorities are conspicuous by his failure to mention or use them. Thus Rodocanachi's work on Rienzo, published in 1888, marked a great step in advance over that of Papencordt, published in 1841, which is alone known to Dr. Cosenza, who is equally unaware of the existence of Brodach's critical edition of Rienzo's correspondence, the most important contribution ever made to the literature of the subject, albeit we still wait for its long-promised introduction. When the name of de Nolhac does not appear in a work devoted to Petrarch's Latin works, it is not surprising not to find mentioned in their appropriate places, *e. g.* (8) Petrarch's comment on a passage of St. Augustine, referring to the decline of the Roman Empire, which he wrote in his manuscript of the *De Civitate Dei*, in 1342, no doubt under the inspiration of his conversations with Rienzo (*Pétrarque et l'Humanisme*, II. 198); (239) de Nolhac's note on the manuscripts of Livy in the papal library at Avignon, at the time when Rienzo was a captive there, and allowed to read his favorite historian (*op. cit.*, II. 11). With such omissions to note, it is not necessary to quarrel over the Latin form of the poet's name, or the peculiar habit of putting the references in the text instead of at the foot of the page.

GEORGE L. HAMILTON.

*Soldan-Heppe, Geschichte der Hexenprozesse.* Neu bearbeitet und herausgegeben von Max Bauer. (Munich, Georg Müller, [1912], pp. xvi, 564; 456.) Even since the publication, in 1900, of the scholarly book of Hansen, the older work of the church historian Soldan (1843) as revised and enlarged by his son-in-law, the not less eminent church historian Heppe (1880), has remained indispensable to the student of the history of witchcraft. For Hansen's book breaks off at 1540, before the witch-persecution had so much as reached its height; and, even for the period covered by Hansen's studies, the earlier work of scholars so able as Soldan and Heppe could not be ignored. But with every passing year the discovery of fresh materials and the publication of fresh studies has increased the need for a revising or a replacing of this one comprehensive history.

It is this need which the work now published undertakes to meet. The editor is well read in the literature of his subject, and everywhere he has used a free hand in cutting out old matter and inserting new. So far as readableness goes, the result is excellent, and the general reader, who seeks only to be informed as to the present state of knowledge, may well be grateful for it. But to the critical scholar the matter has another aspect. Nothing except the general phrases of his preface enables the student to discriminate between the changes of the editor and what is left of the original work. This was true also of the revision by Heppe; but the association of that reviser with the author had been so close and his training so similar that at least a certain integrity was ensured. The present editor, a stranger to his predecessors, writes from a notably different point of view. Even if his changes, like his effacement of the anti-Catholic tinge of the work, are wholly to the taste of a later scholarship, they make shadowy the book's claim to the name of "Soldan-Heppe". Might it not have been better—for all, at least, except the purse of its publisher—if the editor had written the wholly independent work which he was amply qualified to write?

But this is to impeach a custom, not an individual. Granted the wisdom of the custom, Herr Bauer has done his work intelligently. Whatever may be thought of the text of the new edition, there can be only welcome for the wealth of pictures which make its most striking difference from the old. The gathering of these has been a work, not only of diligence, but of scholarship. No such collection of the pictorial sources for the study of the witch superstition has ever been available; and not only old pictures galore, but title-pages, placards, documents, and pages of manuscripts, are here reproduced for the use of scholars. It is an awful exposure of the contents of our grandfathers' imaginations. Not even Scheible's *Kloster* is such a chamber of horrors. Alas, there is no index to them: one cannot be found at need, and they can be stolen from the volumes without detection. Like the absence of a date from the title-page, this suggests that the enterprise is primarily a publisher's.

G. L. B.

*Geschichte der Päpste seit dem Ausgang des Mittelalters.* Von Ludwig von Pastor. Sechster Band. *Geschichte der Päpste im Zeitalter der Katholischen Reformation und Restauration: Julius III., Marcellus II. und Paul IV. (1550-1559).* (Freiburg i. B., Herder, 1913, pp. xl, 723.) The qualities of the eminent historian of the popes no longer need description. His new volume covers an eventful decade, and with his usual thoroughness. Julius III. is clearly no hero to Herr von Pastor; but the short-lived Marcellus was a pope after his own heart, and between the two, as if to mark the transition to a new age, the historian has interpolated a fifty-page "portrayal of the city of Rome at the end of the Renaissance period". It is an historical guide-book of the first rank. But what is most consummate in the present volume is perhaps the insight and the fairness with which he can depict a Paul the Fourth. "A genuine Southron, with whom the thought is instantly a word, he let himself be led by the ebullitions of the moment into utterances which would be incredible, were they not vouched for by testimony which can not be impeached. And to his words answered deeds as hasty. On every side it was evident that Paul IV. was as lacking in knowledge of the world and of men as in the moderation and the shrewdness which were doubly needed in a time of transition and of ferment." And the historian shows how thus he alienated Spain, the Emperor, England, and his cardinals, and minces no words in censuring his abuse of Inquisition and of Index. "Yet the reign of Paul IV., despite all its blunders and misconceptions, marks an important stage in the history of the Catholic Reformation, for whose victory it prepared the way. . . . What the noble Adrian VI., last of the German Popes, had in vain attempted—the break with the evil tendencies of the Renaissance—the fiery Neapolitan achieved."

G. L. B.

*Henri IV., raconté par lui-même.* Choix de Lettres et Harangues publiées avec une Introduction. Par J. Nouaillac, Professeur agrégé de l'Université, Docteur ès Lettres. (Paris, Alphonse Picard et Fils, 1913, pp. 391.) The seductive charm of Henry IV.'s personality has led M. Nouaillac, as it had previously led Dussieux, Gaudet, and others, to republish some of the king's letters. The 234 which he has selected contain nothing wholly new; they have all been printed before, mostly by Berger de Xivrey in the *Collection des Documents Inédits sur l'Histoire de France*. But they have been selected with discrimination and taste, and give a vivid and satisfactory portrait of the king by his own hand. They stretch in time from a letter to his mother in 1566, when he was twelve years old, to one in 1610 when as a gray-beard he sought to recover the fugitive sixteen-year old Charlotte de Montmorency. They are selected to show all sides of his character as it appeared in his correspondence with his successive mistresses, ministers, relatives, and companions in arms. In their graphic, breathless brevity they are a refreshing contrast to the tiresome verbiage of ordinary public documents.

A letter of three lines suffices to make joyful the heart of a victorious friend: "Tes victoires m'empêchent de dormir, comme anciennement celles de Miltiade Thémistocle. A Dieu, Givry, voilà tes vanités payées." If the king lost at play he simply wrote to Sully, "Mon ami, Je vous prie de faire rendre incontinent à ce porteur trois mille pistoles qu'il m'a prêtées, et que j'ai perdues"; but if he won, he delightedly put the money in his hat, exclaiming, "Je tiens bien ceux-ci, on ne me les dérobera pas, car ils ne passeront point par les mains de mes trésoriers." His description of the battle of Ivry is very characteristic of his rapid, concise style: "Monsr de La Noue, Dieu nous a bénis. Ce jourd'huy, quatorzième de ce présent mois, la bataille s'est donnée. Il a été bien combattu; Dieu a montré qu'il aimait mieux le droit que la force; la victoire nous a été absolue: l'ennemi tout rompu, les reîtres en partie défaits, l'infanterie rendue, les Bourguignons malmenés, la cornette blanche et le canon pris, la poursuite jusqu'aux portes de Mantes." Only in his letters to his mistresses do sentiment and fancy lead him to somewhat longer letters, as in the beautiful description of the scenery at Maran, a description which so justly excited the admiration of Saint-Beuve; part, however, of the length of these longer letters is due to the vehement protestations of affection with which they close.

M. Nouaillac's explanatory notes are sufficiently brief and informing. His introductory sketch of Henry IV. as "le roi, l'homme de guerre, l'homme d'état, l'homme privé, et l'écrivain", is vivacious and enthusiastic, and also accords with the impression left by the king's own letters.

SIDNEY B. FAY.

*Studies in British History and Politics.* By D. P. Heatley, Lecturer in History, University of Edinburgh. (London, Smith, Elder, and Company, 1913, pp. xv., 219.) Mr. Heatley's volume consists of five essays. The first, Bacon, Milton, and Laud: Three Points of View, is a study of the ideas of these three on the proper relations of Church and State. The second, with the infelicitous title, An American-Independence Group, is in part a study of those statesmen of the American Revolution who had been connected with the University of Edinburgh, in part an analysis of the movement for independence. To contend for imperial unity seems to the author much broader-minded than to contend for constitutionalism, and therefore he seems somewhat to lament, as of late British writers are prone to do, the American drift toward independence. This is to forget that an imperial union was at that time certain to be badly managed. To be a great empire is inspiring, to be a badly managed portion of a great empire is not. Undertaking to manage for themselves, the Americans became a much greater empire than that of which in 1775 they were a part, and found abundant inspiration in a condition not involving union with Great Britain. The third essay, Some Marks of English History, is a discourse on the English habits of political action. The fourth, Politics as a Practical Study, is but to a slight extent historical. The fifth is a sensible appreciation

of Maitland. All these essays have many good thoughts, and all are profitable in suggesting or provoking further thinking, but the actual sum of new and original thought is less than the reader might imagine from the style, which is ambitious, labored, over-ingenious, at times even tortuous.

*Letters and Papers relating to the First Dutch War, 1652-1654.* Edited by C. T. Atkinson, Fellow of Exeter College. Volume V. [Publications of the Navy Records Society, vol. XLI.] (London, the Society, 1912, pp. xvi, 429.) This additional volume of the voluminous compilation begun by Mr. S. R. Gardiner and now edited by Mr. Atkinson consists of materials for the history of the war from May 2/12 to August 27/September 6, 1653. That is to say, it illustrates the battle of the Gabbard Shoal, the ensuing blockade of the Dutch coast, and the battle of July 30 and 31 (or August 9 and 10), the engagement in which Tromp met his death. The volume contains 188 documents. Half of them are from the State Papers, Domestic, and half of the remainder are translations of Dutch documents from the Rijksarchief at the Hague. Of the rest, the greater number are documents previously printed in Granville Penn's *Life of Sir William Penn* and elsewhere, while a dozen are derived from the Clarendon Manuscripts. As in previous volumes, we have despatches, letters, reports, lists, and other documents, and there are some fifty pages of introductory explanations. There is no index, and though no doubt one will be presented in the volume which concludes this formidable series, its absence is meantime a disadvantage, the five volumes thus far issued having been published at intervals from 1899 to the present time. We may expect that another volume will finish the series.

The two great battles to which most of these documents directly or more remotely relate are marked off from their predecessors as purely naval battles, in which merchant vessels under merchant captains no longer appeared, and in which the action of fleet on fleet was made the sole end, to the exclusion of commerce-destroying. Strategically therefore we are now in the period of modern naval warfare. For the development of modern naval tactics the evidence is less distinct. The Fighting Instructions issued by Blake, Deane, and Monck at the end of March had plainly opened a new period, but the present documents, expounded so admirably by Mr. Atkinson, go no farther than to show us some marks of progress in orderly fighting, such as the use of the line-ahead in squadronal and other subdivisions.

*The Political Philosophy of Burke.* By John MacCunn, Emeritus Professor of Philosophy, University of Liverpool. (New York, Longmans, Green, and Company; London, Edward Arnold, 1913, pp. vi, 272.) Professor MacCunn's volume is not an encyclopaedic treatise on Burke's political science, such as the nature of the subject might readily invite. It is, on the contrary, a series of genial essays on the capital topics which

engaged that great thinker's attention, such as theory itself, prudence, conservatism, the wisdom of our ancestors, toleration, religion and politics, government, rights, and democracy. With these subjects in mind, our author has gone through Burke's writings with evident care, and he has here set forth just those doctrines which illustrate the Whig philosopher's maturest judgment in such matters. Where there are contradictions (and there are many, for Burke wrote according to time and circumstance) the author has attempted to clarify and explain; where there are exaggerations (and there are many, for Burke was a man of great passion) our author has freely criticized. Nevertheless, the spirit of the volume is eminently sympathetic—even more generous in tone than Morley's classic apology; but this sympathy does not prevent the author from finding a place for radicals like Paine, or from showing very clearly how narrow on one side was Burke's vision. In a single paragraph our author sums up his final judgment: "We find in Burke's writings the presence of two things, and the absence of a third. We find an unfaltering faith in the presence of a 'Divine tactic' in the lives of men and nations. We find also an *apologia* such as has never been equalled, for the existing social and political system as it has come to be by the long toil of successive generations. What we do not find, and are fain to wish for, and most of all from a thinker to whom the happiness of the people was always paramount, is some encouragement for the hope that the 'stupendous Wisdom' which has done so much in the past, and even till now, will not fail to operate in the varieties of untried being through which the State, even the democratic State, must pass in the vicissitudes and adventures of the future" (p. 271). Each reader will view this judgment according to his predilections; but to many it will be the most damning doom which an author could pronounce. However that may be, the reviewer may truly say that Professor MacCunn's volume, marked by such clarity and conciseness, is just the book to put into the hands of the student who is seeking the intimate essence of Burke's political science.

CHARLES A. BEARD.

*Figures du Passé: Mirabeau.* Par Louis Barthou. (Paris, Hachette et Cie., 1913, pp. 323.) A new popular life of Mirabeau cannot be said to "meet a long felt want" in historical literature, even in French historical literature, for we already have two very good lives by Rousse and Mézières. But a life of Mirabeau by a French prime minister is as unique as a volume on Napoleon by a Rosebery and should give us an interpretation of the great Frenchman quite different, in some respects, from that found in the volumes of the two academicians. Although clearly the work of a ripe mind and of a statesman, the book is the product of an amateur in historical writing. The bibliography is incomplete, M. Barthou being acquainted only with material in the French language, and the account suffers in more than one particular because of the ignorance of the writer concerning what has been written on



Mirabeau in German, Dutch, and English. Although not fully acquainted with the Mirabeau literature, M. Barthou has contributed something of first-rate importance in the way of original material, some unpublished letters of Mirabeau. Here, *in extenso*, I have found letters hitherto known to me only in short printed extracts, the originals of which had disappeared. There are not many of them, to be sure, but they are important enough to distinguish this volume from all the other popular lives of Mirabeau. Additional value is given to the volume by the excellent full-page pictures of Mirabeau, of his father, of his wife, and of Madame de Nehra. The most striking illustration of all is the reproduction of the two-colored crayon, reproducing the wonderful death mask of Mirabeau. A last little artistic and sentimental touch is given to the volume by the reproduction on the title-page—in color—and as tail-pieces, of the seal made by Mirabeau for Sophie de Monnier and himself. To make the volume perfect in illustration but two things were lacking: the bust of Mirabeau at thirty and a portrait of Sophie de Monnier. Nearly two-thirds of the volume are devoted to the last five years of Mirabeau's life, not a good proportion, on general principles, but one not likely to call forth objections in this case, as the treatment of the work of Mirabeau in the National Assembly is the really valuable part of the book and may be read with profit even by those who know the sources of the period as well or even better than M. Barthou. Nowhere will be found a more just estimate of the tragic significance, both for Mirabeau and for France, of the decree of November 7, 1789, excluding the members of the assembly from the ministry. "It broke the only force capable of consolidating the revolution by moderating it. It was in truth that day and not the day of Mirabeau's death that 'the débris of the monarchy became the prey of factions' and that the revolution by terror won its first victory over the revolution by law." An "impassioned orator" and a "powerful realist", Mirabeau was "refused by destiny the rôle, between Richelieu and Bonaparte, fitted to his genius, hardly inferior to theirs".

FRED MORROW FLING.

*Les Clubs de Barbès et de Blanqui en 1848.* Par Suzanne Wassermann, Diplômée d'Études Supérieures d'Histoire et Géographie. [Bibliothèque d'Histoire Moderne, publiée sous les Auspices de la Société d'Histoire Moderne, fascicule XII.] (Paris, Édouard Cornély et Cie., 1913, pp. xxii, 248.) The Revolution of 1848 was made in the name of the right of public meeting, and was followed immediately and naturally by a general and enthusiastic assertion of that right. This assertion took the form of clubs established on the very morrow of the revolution for the purpose of discussion and agitation. The number of these clubs increased rapidly. By the end of March there were 150 of them, and there is contemporary evidence tending to show that there were soon at least 450. Now that universal suffrage was the law of the land these clubs offered the new voters an easy opportunity to present



their views, to propose their remedies, and to exert their influence upon the course of events. They were all the more frequented as, owing to the economic crisis, many voters were out of work and possessed consequent leisure. Moreover the free expression of opinion was a new and pleasing distraction for many in that period of uncertainty; when the ordinary routine of life was impossible. This remarkable development of club activity early aroused the apprehension of the *bourgeoisie* who, after the June Days, were able to restrict this disconcerting right of public meeting. By a decree of July 28 this movement was practically brought to a close. It had lasted about four months. During that time every important or unimportant leader of advanced opinion had his club which served as a sounding board for his ideas.

The two chief leaders in this work of criticism and propaganda were Barbès and Blanqui, two Socialist Republicans, to whom the Revolution of 1848 brought a very fleeting release from long years of imprisonment for opinion's sake. Each had his club, whose organization and significance Mlle. Wassermann presents with conspicuous success in this monograph. The author's conclusion is that the rôle of Barbès and Blanqui has been exaggerated and distorted by historical writers. "Neither the one nor the other seems to have had a decisive action upon events." The famous *journées* of those turbulent months, the 17th of March, the 16th of April, and the 15th of May, were not their work, though they had a relation, which is carefully indicated, to each.

The history of the clubs of Barbès and Blanqui is important as throwing light upon the history of the Socialist movement of 1848. The weakness of the Socialists lay in the fact that they represented a small minority, that the mass of the people did not follow them, and that they had no practical measures to propose. But what contributed most to their speedy overthrow was their own hesitations and divisions.

This monograph is solid and minute in its research, clear and animated in its mode of presentation, and admirable in its critical power, which is shown both in the text and in the notes.

CHARLES DOWNER HAZEN.

*The Taylor Papers: being a Record of Certain Reminiscences, Letters, and Journals in the Life of Lieut.-Gen. Sir Herbert Taylor, G.C.B., G.C.H.* Arranged by Ernest Taylor. (London, New York, Bombay, and Calcutta, Longmans, Green, and Company, 1913, pp. xii, 520.) Sir Herbert Taylor, the subject of this volume, had a varied official career, beginning about the time of the French revolutionary wars and extending through the reign of William IV. into that of Victoria. While his profession was the army, in which he served as military secretary to the Duke of York, and later, from 1828 to 1830, as adjutant-general of the forces, other employment brought him into close relations with the royal family through successive appointments as private secretary to George III., to Queen Charlotte, and to William IV.

It goes without saying that the papers left by one who saw so much

of the later Georgian era, both from the army office and from Windsor, ought to be of interest. But of these papers, the official memoranda, or the bulk of them, were destroyed. It is only from the remainder, consisting of rather colorless memoirs, of journals, and of letters not strictly official, that this volume has been compiled. So far as these illustrate Sir Herbert Taylor's personal career, they need scarcely be regarded. As furnishing material for the Georgian era, a few, scattered here and there, are not without a slight value, though they are really too miscellaneous in character to be brought within a general criticism. Among the memoirs, chiefly military, are references to specific operations of the British army, and also to its lack of organization during the French revolutionary wars. Some of the correspondence from India and the colonies reveals conditions of army service and promotions characteristic of the period. Letters from members of the royal family include one from the very limited correspondence of the Princess Charlotte, daughter of George IV. A few of the letters received during the crisis of the First Reform Bill were quite worth printing; so also were others received after 1832, as for example—one defending the establishment of the church because of the patronage it offered the government of the day; another, from Lord Palmerston, explaining the nature of political consistency as understood by himself; and several on the burden of colonial and imperial military expenditure. But the absence of a subject-index destroys the usefulness of the volume for such special references.

Sir Herbert Taylor will be remembered as the author of a pamphlet replying to an article in the *Edinburgh Review* by Brougham attacking George III. and the royal family. It is remarkable and in many respects unfortunate that Taylor, who on this one occasion wrote from his official knowledge deprecating the Whig animadversions upon his royal patrons, should have left behind apparently no other papers which can be used even indirectly to counteract the alleged distortions of the Whig writers.

C. E. FRYER.

*The Governments of Europe.* By Frederic Austin Ogg, Ph.D., Assistant Professor of History, Simmons College. (New York, The Macmillan Company, 1913, pp. xiv, 668.) Professor Ogg's volume has been prepared primarily as a text-book for use in college courses, and it may be well to consider the book in the light of the three considerations which, according to the preface, have mainly determined its content. The first consideration has been that of affording an opportunity for the comparative study of political institutions through a discussion of the governments of the minor as well as of the major countries of western and central Europe. Whereas the excellent work of President Lowell dealt with but five countries (or six if Austria-Hungary be counted as two) of Continental Europe, Professor Ogg, with greater space at his disposal it is true, discusses the governments of England, Germany, and

France, and more briefly Switzerland, Austria-Hungary, the Netherlands, Belgium, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, Spain, and Portugal. Covering so much territory, the author must necessarily treat some governments with undue brevity, and has no space within which to trace out some of the comparisons which would have been fruitful. Perhaps if he had limited the geographical extent of his discussion, space might have been found for some chapters dealing comparatively with such subjects as, electoral systems, the varying aspects of parliamentary government, the relations between upper and lower houses, federal and unitary governments, and the relation of constitutions to ordinary legislation. In such general discussions the fundamental principles involved in the governments of some of the minor countries might have been presented without the necessity of discussing such governments in full; so, for example, might have been treated the electoral and party systems of Belgium. The book fails to guide in the very matter where the student most needs guidance, and if it be replied that the teacher may furnish this guidance, perhaps it may be sufficient to point out that the teacher is most apt to use the tools furnished him, and to try to do what cannot be adequately done—to cover substantially all the countries of Europe in a brief course.

With respect to his second consideration, that of taking into careful account the historical origins of the governments under consideration, the author has succeeded admirably. His historical discussions, though brief, are clear and satisfactory.

Professor Ogg's third consideration has been that of including in the book some treatment of political parties and of the institutions of local government; and here he has not succeeded so well. The pages devoted to local government are, in large part because of their compression, perhaps the least interesting parts of the book, and even as regards the more important countries present somewhat the appearance of a digest. In the accounts of political parties there is no close and interesting correlation between organization and practice such as one finds in Lowell's volumes.

After these criticisms, which relate primarily to the plan adopted by the author, it should be said, however, that Professor Ogg has produced a useful and important work, of value as a text-book for courses on comparative government and as a guide to anyone interested in the governments of the countries of western and central Europe. The volume is written in a clear and concise, but not highly interesting, style. There are some errors, but considering the amount of detail dealt with, the book is singularly accurate.

W. F. DODD.

*Journals of the House of Burgesses of Virginia, 1702/3-1705, 1705-1706, 1710-1712.* Edited by H. R. McIlwaine. (Richmond, 1912, pp. xviii, 369.) All the journals in this volume are derived from the British Public Record Office, where manuscript copies transmitted from Virginia

are preserved, though the originals once kept in the colony have disappeared. They seem to have been printed very carefully, certainly have been printed very handsomely, with intelligent and sufficient introductions, almost no notes, and a good index. The use of record type for ordinary abbreviations is needless, and the time-worn solecism of "ye" for "the" is not to be approved. One or two volumes more, it may be expected, will extend the series back to its designated terminus in 1680, when the house of burgesses first achieved a separate existence by parting company with the council.

Three assemblies figure in the present volume: that of 1703-1705, with four sessions, that of 1705-1706, with one session, and that of 1710-1712, with two sessions. The first two were held in the building of the College of William and Mary, the last five in the new Capitol at Williamsburg. Both these buildings, by the way, are shown, the latter uncompleted, in drawings lately discovered in the university library of Bern, Switzerland, accompanying the journal of a Swiss traveller of about 1700. Fifty representatives of twenty-five counties made up each assembly, with a member for Jamestown in the last two, but as yet no representatives of Williamsburg or of the college. Peter Beverley was speaker of the first and third of these assemblies, Benjamin Harrison, jr., of the second. The governors were Colonel Francis Nicholson, Edward Nott, and Alexander Spotswood.

The period of the volume is almost precisely that of the War of the Spanish Succession. Military preparations and measures occupy much space. The subsidy toward the defense of New York, which Nicholson was instructed to urge, was never forthcoming, but a good deal was contributed toward the war, especially under the energetic Spotswood. A transaction which perhaps had more lasting importance, however, was the final passage, in June, 1706, of the revised statutes prepared by the committee of revisal appointed in 1699. These thirty-nine general laws, supplemented by a few others of general import passed in the sessions immediately succeeding, constituted Virginia's legal code till the revision of 1748.

The period was one in which exceptional harmony prevailed between burgesses and governor, and, with the exception of the last of these seven sessions, between burgesses and council. The volume does not embrace the records of great constitutional struggles; but it contains a rich mass of information on a great variety of Virginian topics.

*From Jefferson to Lincoln.* By William MacDonald. (New York, Henry Holt and Company; London, Williams and Norgate, 1913, pp. vi, 256.) The many admirable qualities of this little volume will certainly win for it a hearty welcome from a wide and varied constituency. Readers of the REVIEW, it may be safely assumed, will be greatly interested in it for its handling of the problem of condensing so large a subject into fifty thousand words and for the interpretation which, after an illuminating study of the Jacksonian epoch and much reviewing of the

recent literature, Professor MacDonald now puts upon the whole period.

Condensation has been achieved by the use of a terse, but clear and attractive, style, by giving to the years 1815 to 1850 only one-half of the book, and by close adherence to the narration of events. Only two short chapters, one for 1815, the other for the early fifties, are devoted to the description of the conditions which prevailed in the country. Doubtless the method has its justification. It involves, nevertheless, an inadequate treatment of the earlier years, even of the Jacksonian period, and the omission of essential descriptive matter which by a more evenly balanced treatment might have been included.

Professor MacDonald's treatment of his subject shows wide departure at many points from the views commonly found in the older works upon the period. A notable instance occurs in a striking paragraph on page 141, "It can no longer be said, as it has commonly been said, that slavery was the root of sectionalism. . . . Instead of sectionalism arising because of slavery, it would be truer to say that slavery persisted because of sectionalism." Yet the variation from the point of view of the older works is more a matter of details than of substance. The interpretation, taken as a whole, is conservative and even ultra-cautious about the acceptance of the results of recent special studies.

Constitutional growth, the history of political parties, and slavery receive the chief attention. Upon each of these topics an astonishingly large amount of well-arranged, accurate, and significant information is presented. The accounts of the Kansas-Nebraska Bill, the election of 1856, and the Dred Scott case are ample enough to warrant the criticism that portions of them might have been spared, along with some matters of minor importance, to make way for a more adequate treatment of the earlier stages of the Whig party, the economic and constitutional doctrines of the South, and the development and spread of the plantation system. A few maps, especially for the Mexican War, the territorial acquisitions, and the boundary questions would have added to the serviceability of the volume. The bibliographical note is excellent, but might have been much improved, without undue expansion, by the inclusion of a large number of the recent special studies.

FRANK MALOY ANDERSON.

*The Life of Thaddeus Stevens.* A Study in American Political History especially in the Period of the Civil War and Reconstruction. By James Albert Woodburn, Ph.D., LL.D., Professor of American History and Politics, Indiana University. (Indianapolis, The Bobbs-Merrill Company, 1913, pp. 620.) While Mr. Woodburn has used the Stevens Manuscripts found among the McPherson papers in the Library of Congress, he does not profess that this volume is an adequate exposition of the results that may be obtained from a careful study of such material. This life, in fact, differs from those which have preceded it not so much in the material used as in the selection from that material. Mr. Woodburn's method has been to let Stevens tell his own story, and he has

presented it as Stevens himself did, that is chiefly in the form of public utterance. Fully 250 out of the 610 pages of text consist of extracts from or abstracts of Stevens's speeches, taken chiefly from the *Congressional Globe*.

The book, however, is no mere compilation, but the ripened study of a mature mind. The background is firm and true, and Stevens stands out against it, with his direct and pointed speech, clear and distinct as a silhouette. While Stevens's attitude towards slavery and reconstruction naturally claims the major portion of the space, his interest in education, and his democracy, which underlay his whole attitude from boyhood to death, receive due attention. The special interest of Mr. Woodburn, however, is in Stevens's financial views. To this subject he devotes chapters XI., XXI., and XXII., and he succeeds in clarifying Stevens's exact position from the misconceptions which have surrounded it. On this subject more than any other the author puts forward his own views, using the cudgels to support Stevens's proposals, and it is here that he makes his greatest contribution to the history of the period. It is a subject upon which one cannot as yet expect general agreement, but these chapters command the attention of students of finance and particularly of currency.

Mr. Woodburn's book is not an apology for Stevens, but he sympathetically sets forth Stevens's own apology. There are obvious dangers in letting a man tell his own story, but Stevens is one of those vigorous, self-sufficing characters, who excite in most minds opposition, rather than sympathy, and he deserves a chance to be heard in his own cause. He certainly makes a convincing case for his consistency and honesty. The main defects in such a method are its exclusions. On Stevens the man, including the question of his private morality, Mr. Woodburn fairly presents the evidence. The great lack is a study of Stevens the tactician. Few will accept in its full implications the statement that under Stevens's leadership, "The House following was free to act". While Stevens undoubtedly worked chiefly in the open, he did not rule the House by the tongue alone. One could wish for some discussion of his parliamentary methods and his handling of the machinery of congressional action.

The makeup of the book is unimpressive, and the index is valueless.

CARL RUSSELL FISH.

*The Picture Book of Earlier Buffalo.* [Buffalo Historical Society Publications, vol. XVI., edited by Frank H. Severance.] (Buffalo, N. Y., the Society, 1912, pp. xx, 508.) Few better ideas have ever occurred to the mind of a secretary of a city historical society than that which inspired Mr. Severance to make this book. His project was to preserve in permanent form all existing pictures of old Buffalo, 1820-1870 for the most part, and of its vanished buildings. More than 400 of his 508 pages are occupied with these reproductions. The earliest such picture known is "A View of the Lake and Fort Erie, from Buffalo Creek"



(London, 1811), but very few others are of earlier dates than 1820. The four hundred pictures represent, in the utmost variety, Buffalo, parts of Buffalo, and old churches, theatres, hotels, schools, factories, business blocks, residences, and so forth, which the marvellous growth of Buffalo in recent times has caused to be destroyed. Hardly any of them are beautiful, most of them exhibit to the full the marvellously complete and determined hideousness which marked American town architecture in the half-century named. Yet Mr. Severance's modest, pleasant letter-press convinces the reader, if he needs to be convinced, that the task was well worth performing, well worth the great pains he has expended in collection and elucidation. He has no illusions about the greatness of his Mantua, or the artistic quality of his material, but a manly sense that a community so important ought to take an interest in the details of its appearance in past times. It were much to be wished that such a book, executed with equal industry and intelligence, might be made for every one of our large cities before it is too late.

*A History of Muhlenberg County.* By Otto A. Rothert. (Louisville, Ky., John P. Morton and Company, 1913, pp. xvii, 496.) This book, it may be said in the outset, is not one of those commercial projects—one is tempted to say commercial frauds—so frequently put forth now-a-days as county histories, but has been written solely because of the author's interest in the subject and his desire to preserve the county's history from oblivion. The author has spent much of his time during the past seven years in gathering materials for the work, largely traditions and personal narratives. The official history of the county he has made but small attempt to relate. Official and other written records, although used to some extent, he has for the most part passed by, preferring to preserve first of all those more perishable materials which repose only in the minds of the oldest (or next oldest) inhabitants. An exception is the diary of Isaac Bard, 1848-1872, of which a considerable part is printed.

Muhlenberg, although not organized as a separate county until 1798, bears the name of a Revolutionary hero. The first settlers came into the region about 1784 and by the end of the eighteenth century the population was increasing rapidly. Many pages of the volume are occupied with accounts of the early settlements and with the personal history of the pioneers and their immediate descendants. There are also several extended sketches of persons prominent in the later history of the county. Naturally there are chapters descriptive of the mode of life at different periods, as there are also chapters on several phases of industrial life as well as upon the religious and educational history of the county. The part which men of Muhlenberg county took in the several wars is related at some length. A chapter of recollections of the Civil War is contributed by Mr. R. T. Martin. An appendix includes, besides a number of articles by other hands than the author's, a journal of a trip to New Orleans in 1803, by James Weir.



The book not only contains much that is of interest to the student of Kentucky history but is written in a pleasing style. An interesting feature is the illustrations, of which there are more than two hundred, largely pictures of historic places and buildings, taken by the author.

*University and Historical Addresses: Delivered during a Residence in the United States as Ambassador of Great Britain.* By James Bryce. (New York, The Macmillan Company, 1913, pp. ix, 433.) It is commonly believed that the chief function of the ambassadors exchanged between Great Britain and the United States is to interpret their respective countries to the peoples to whom they are accredited. They are in a real sense the ambassadors not of sovereigns but of friendly nations. James Bryce has fulfilled this function in his six years' residence in the United States, but his greatest service to history has been in interpreting the American people to themselves. His *American Commonwealth*, published in 1888, if it did not cause it, was at least carried in on the first wave of the new interest in problems of government that has been characteristic of the last generation. No other ear than his has heard the confidential truth from so wide a range of friends. Probably no American politician has been so well informed upon the currents of American affairs as this quiet British scholar has been. And when he was sent to Washington as ambassador in 1907 there was a unanimous feeling that England had done her best. The speeches that are preserved in his new volume are no new *American Commonwealth*. They contain no novel facts and are never contributions to a profound scholarship. They are entirely non-political, from the necessities of the public office of their speaker; but their range of subjects shows the change in American intellectual currents since the publication of the *American Commonwealth*. Mr. Bryce could speak on only those topics upon which all Americans agree, yet we find him discussing history, law, the Constitution, the racial elements of the United States, art, literature, and university functions in a language that would have been incomprehensible in the days of James G. Blaine. He rarely uses the phrases of a perfunctory cordiality and he rarely flatters; he comments upon American democracy as less complete than that of England, and no man contradicts him; he criticizes the political practices of the United States as a colleague and an associate, never as a visitor or a stranger. His addresses are not particularly eloquent, and make no parade of dignity, but they are sound and sensible, and by their existence prove the general acceptance by the United States of notions that Lowell and Godkin and Schurz and Curtis despaired of ever seeing established. The optimism that, while opening one sore after another in 1888, found the United States still healthy and vigorous, endures in these speeches, and continues to find in the new United States proofs of the practicability of democracy.

FREDERIC L. PAXSON.

## COMMUNICATION

ITHACA, July 15, 1913.

*The Managing Editor:*

*Dear Sir,*

On reading in the July REVIEW my paper *Anent the Middle Ages* I am grieved to find that the date cited (p. 714, foot-note) for the earliest mention of a Middle Age appears as 1539. It should be 1639. Alas, on turning to the copy sent the printer, I find the blame to be wholly my own: the error was overlooked not only in the proofs but in the type-writing.

Penitently yours,

GEORGE L. BURR.

## NOTES AND NEWS

### AMERICAN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

The annual meeting of the American Historical Association will be held in Charleston and Columbia, South Carolina, December 29-31. The programme arranged for the meeting is, of course, at this date incomplete. It seems sufficiently definite however to justify the announcements that follow, and it is expected that such notification to the members of the association may make it unnecessary to mail them *two* editions of the completed programme.

The meeting will open, in Charleston, Monday morning, December 29, and will continue in that city throughout that day and Tuesday, with sessions each morning, afternoon, and night. Of the two night sessions, the first will be devoted to the presidential address by Professor William A. Dunning of Columbia University; the second will be the general session upon American history. In the latter the list of papers to be presented is not yet ready for publication.

The conferences or sectional meetings to be held during the mornings and afternoons of these two days include the following: The Economic History of the Middle Ages, with the opening paper by Professor Leo Wiener of Harvard; Historical Materials, with papers by W. C. Ford, Esq., of Boston, Dr. C. H. Hart of Philadelphia, and Dr. C. O. Paullin of Washington, D. C.; American Religious History, with papers by Professor E. B. Greene of Illinois and Dr. J. F. Jameson of Washington, D. C.; Legal Materials as Sources for English History, led by Professor A. L. Cross of Michigan; The Relation of the United States and Mexico, with the opening paper by Dr. Justin H. Smith of Boston; Colonial Commerce, led by Professor C. M. Andrews of Yale; The Teaching of History, with papers by Professors N. W. Stephenson of Charleston, and Beverley W. Bond, jr., of Purdue. There will be also a conference upon military history, and a conference of historical societies; but the programmes of these must be deferred to a later announcement. The business meeting of the association is to occupy a part of Tuesday afternoon.

On Wednesday, December 31, after the adjournment of the association to Columbia, there will be a joint session with the Mississippi Valley Historical Association, a conference of archivists, and a sectional meeting for the students of classical history. In the last, papers may be expected from Professors R. V. D. Magoffin of Johns Hopkins and F. B. Marsh of Texas.

In the formal programme, to be distributed later, will be made the necessary announcements as to railroad facilities, hotels, etc. Plans are afoot for the securing of a special train to start from New York. For information respecting it, members are referred to Professor Carle-

ton H. Hayes of Columbia University. It has been suggested, also, that arrangements may be made for a similar train from Chicago. At Charleston, headquarters will be at the Charleston Hotel.

The annual bibliography entitled *Writings on American History*, prepared by Miss Grace G. Griffin, which has of late been printed by the American Historical Association as a part of its annual Report, also as a separate volume, will hereafter be issued as an independent publication by the Yale University Press. It is hoped that the volume for 1912 may be thus published early next winter. The existing series consists of the volume for 1903, published by the Carnegie Institution of Washington, the volumes for 1906, 1907, 1908, published independently by the Macmillan Company, and those for 1909, 1910, and 1911 (the latter forthcoming) issued as "separates" by the American Historical Association. All these can be procured from the secretary of the association.

Messrs. Ginn and Company have announced the first volume of the *Bibliography of Modern English History* which is being compiled by a committee of the American Historical Association and a corresponding British committee.

In the *Original Narratives* series, the volume entitled *Narratives of the Indian Wars, 1675-1699*, edited by Dr. C. H. Lincoln, is nearly ready for publication. The editing of the *Narratives of the Witchcraft Cases*, by Professor Burr, is well advanced.

#### PERSONAL

John Haughton Coney, professor of history at Princeton University, died in New York City July 25.

Josephus Nelson Larned, for 20 years (1877-1897) superintendent of the Buffalo library, died on August 15, aged seventy-seven. Besides a *History of Buffalo* (1911) he had produced a large repertory in seven volumes, called *History for Ready Reference* (1895-1910), and had also edited the useful manual *Literature of American History* (1902).

Colonel Reuben T. Durrett, for many years the leader in historical work in Kentucky, founder of the Filson Club, and collector of a notable library of Western history (recently acquired by the University of Chicago), died on September 16, at the age of eighty-nine.

Haven W. Edwards, head of the department of history in the Oakland (California) High School, and secretary of the Pacific Coast Branch of the American Historical Association, died in Berkeley on April 27. He had nearly completed the elaborate report on the archives of California which he was making for the association.

Professor William S. Ferguson of Harvard will serve as professor in the American School of Classical Studies in Athens during the present

academic year; Professor R. F. Scholz of the University of California will be lecturer in ancient history at Harvard during the first half year.

Dr. H. M. Henry, formerly instructor in history at Vanderbilt University, has been elected professor of history in Emory and Henry College.

David R. Moore has been appointed professor of medieval and modern history at Oberlin College.

Professor W. M. Sweet, assistant professor of history at Ohio Wesleyan University, has been appointed professor of history at De Pauw University.

Associate Professors Clarence W. Alvord and Laurence M. Larson of the University of Illinois have been promoted to the rank of full professors. Dr. Albert H. Lybyer, professor of history in Oberlin College, has been appointed associate professor of history in the same university; Dr. Frederick Duncalfe of the University of Texas assistant professor.

#### GENERAL

General reviews: H. Déhérain, *Les Sociétés d'Histoire et de Géographie et leurs Publications* (Journal des Savants, April); R. Schneider, *Chronique d'Histoire de l'Art* (Revue des Questions Historiques, July).

The List of Doctoral Dissertations in History now in Progress, which the managing editor of this journal has since 1897 printed annually for private distribution, and which in the last academic year was published in the number of the *History Teacher's Magazine* for January, 1913, will hereafter be printed in the successive January issues of this journal.

Dr. Hervey M. Bowman of Berlin, Ontario, has followed up his previous remarks in the *Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada* on the principles of history by an article of considerable value on "Fundamental Processes in Historical Science, I., The Correct Process".

Among the new volumes in the *Home University Library* is a *History of Freedom of Thought* by Professor J. B. Bury of Cambridge.

*Comparative Religion*, by Professor F. B. Jevons, is a recent and an excellent addition to the *Cambridge Manuals of Science and Literature*, a series which is fulfilling its promise of scholarship and readableness.

The Romanes Lecture of 1913 was delivered by Sir W. M. Ramsay, and is now published by the Clarendon Press under the title *The Imperial Peace: an Ideal in European History*. Sir William sets forth the nature and origin of Dante's idea of the universal monarch, and of peace, not passive but an active power, as the condition of justice and freedom among men, and examines the relation of the spirit of nationality, in medieval and modern times, to the peace of the world.

In *Essentials in Early European History* Samuel B. Howe has followed a suggestion of the Committee of Five by including in one survey ancient, medieval, and modern history for school-room use.

Messrs. Putnam have published *The History of Geography* (pp. 75), by J. Scott Keltie. The volume forms one of the series *History of the Sciences*.

A new series of historical wall-maps is being edited by Dr. Hermann Haack and Professor Heinrich Hertzberg, with the co-operation of a number of other scholars, and published by Justus Perthes of Gotha. It is planned to have eight maps illustrative of ancient history; eleven of German history; fourteen of European history; nine of cultural and colonial history; and eleven of military history. In addition to the principal maps there will be a number of smaller sketches and plans appearing as inserts.

The Leipzig firm of H. A. L. Degener is about to begin the publication of a comprehensive and systematic *Handbuch der Praktischen Genealogie*, in two volumes, by Professor Eduard Heydenreich and other authorities.

In the June *Bulletin* of the American Geographical Society Professor A. T. Olmstead follows up his article of June, 1912, in the same journal, on "Climatic Changes in the Nearer East", by further animadversions upon Professor Ellsworth Huntington's recent discussions of the subject and of that article, and upon the article which the latter published in this journal (XVIII. 213-232).

The July *Bulletin* of the New York Public Library contains the beginning of a list of works relating to the history and condition of the Jews in various countries. So large is the library's collection that this part I. of the list fills fifty pages of the *Bulletin*. The August issue continues the list through 54 pages more.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: E. Faguet, *L'Idée de Progrès* (La Revue, April 15); J. Kaerst, *Studien zur Entwicklung und Bedeutung der Universalgeschichtlichen Anschauung* (Historische Zeitschrift, CXI. 2); R. Doucet, *Problèmes et Controverses: dans quelle Mesure les Oeuvres Historiques sont-elles Condamnées à Vieillir?* (Revue de Synthèse Historique, December); K. J. Beloch, *Die Volkszahl als Faktor und Gradmesser der Historischen Entwicklung* (Historische Zeitschrift, CXI. 2); Sir C. R. Markham, *Lost Geographical Documents* (The Geographical Journal, July); L. Germain, *Le Problème de l'Atlantide et la Zoologie* (Annales de Géographie, May 15).

#### ANCIENT HISTORY

General reviews: M. Besnier, *Chronique d'Histoire Ancienne, Grecque et Romaine, Livres Nouveaux* (Revue des Questions Historiques, July); F. Lortzing, *Bericht über die Litteratur zur Aelteren Griechischen*

*Sophistik aus den Jahren 1876-1911* (Jahresbericht über die Fortschritte der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft, CLXIII. I, 3); J. Partsch, *Juristische Litteraturübersicht, 1907-1911* (Archiv für Papyrusforschung, V. 4); J. Toutain, *Antiquités Romaines*, II. (Revue Historique, July).

Of interest and profit to students of comparative religion is *Die Biblische und die Babylonische Gottesidee; die Israelitische Gottesauffassung im Lichte der Altorientalischen Religionsgeschichte*, by D. Johannes Hehn (Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1913, xii, 436).

*International Arbitration amongst the Greeks*, by Marcus Niebuhr Tod (Oxford, Clarendon Press), contains an enumeration of 82 inscriptions utilized in the study.

An excellent selection of 87 *Historische Attische Inschriften* (Bonn, Marcus and Weber, 1913, pp. 82) has been edited by Ernest Nachmanson, privatdozent in the University of Uppsala, for the series of *Kleine Texte für Vorlesungen und Uebungen*. Obviously most of the inscriptions are reproduced from the corpus of *Inscriptiones Graecae* or from Dittenberger's *Sylloge* and its supplement, but nine more recently discovered inscriptions are included. The notes and other aids for the student are succinct and admirably adapted to their purpose. The handy size of the pamphlet and its low price contribute to its adaptability for class use. Another number in the series, announced for early publication, will contain *Griechische Inschriften zur Griechischen Staatenkunde*, edited by F. Bleckmann.

*Greek Imperialism*, by Professor W. S. Ferguson, has been announced by Houghton Mifflin.

The culture and ethnography of prehistoric Europe has been the subject of some important studies recently. Dr. L. Reinhardt has written on *Der Mensch zur Eiszeit in Europa und seine Kulturentwicklung bis zum Ende der Steinzeit* (Munich, Reinhardt, 1913, pp. vii, 592); L. Siret, on *Questions de Chronologie et d'Ethnographie Ibérique* (Tome I., Paris, Geuthner, 1913); and S. Feist, on *Kultur, Ausbreitung, und Herkunft der Indogermanen* (Berlin, Weidmann, 1913, pp. xii, 573).

The *Bollettino della Commissione Romana*, 1912 (XL. 15-102), has an elaborate article by G. Pinza on the remains of prehistoric Rome gathered into the municipal museums in the course of the last forty years.

Wolfgang Riepl has published a novel and interesting study entitled *Das Nachrichtenwesen des Altertums, mit besonderer Rücksicht auf die Römer* (Leipzig, Teubner, 1913, pp. xiv, 478).

O. Meltzer's *Geschichte der Karthager* has been brought to completion by Ulrich Kahrstedt (Berlin, Weidmann, 1913) in a third volume which deals with the period from 218 to 146 B. C.

The English translation of Friedländer's invaluable *Sittengeschichte Roms*, published by E. P. Dutton and Company under the title *Roman Life and Manners under the Early Empire*, has now been completed by the publication of the fourth volume.



In *Byzantine and Romanesque Architecture* (Cambridge University Press) Thomas Graham Jackson covers a wide field with clearness and independence of judgment.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: A. Rivaud, *Recherches sur l'Anthropologie Grecque*, III. (*Revue Anthropologique*, July); P. Wendland, *Hellenistic Ideas of Salvation in the Light of Ancient Anthropology* (*American Journal of Theology*, July); T. Lenschau, *Zur Geschichte Ioniens*, I., *Die Ursachen des Ionischen Aufstandes* (*Klio*, XIII. 2); E. von Stern, *Solon und Peisistratos* (*Hermes*, XLVIII. 3); S. Heinlein, *Die Anfänge des Freiheitskampfes der Griechen gegen die Perser* (*Ungarische Rundschau*, April); O. Immisch, *Der Erste Platonische Brief* (*Philologus*, LXXII. 1); T. Lenschau, *Der Staatsstreich der Vierhundert* (*Rheinisches Museum für Philologie*, LXVIII. 2); A. Rosenberg, *Studien zur Entstehung der Plebs* (*Hermes*, XLVIII. 3); M. O. B. Caspari, *On some Problems of Roman Agrarian History* (*Klio*, XIII. 2); S. Gaselee, *The Common People of the Early Roman Empire* (*Edinburgh Review*, July); L. Homo, *L'Empereur Gallien et la Crise de l'Empire Romain au III<sup>e</sup> Siècle*, completed (*Revue Historique*, July-August); L. Holzapfel, *Römische Kaiserdaten*, II., *Otho* (*Klio*, XIII. 2).

#### EARLY CHURCH HISTORY

Professor F. Cavallera, of the Catholic Institute of Toulouse, has rendered a notable service in preparing a volume of *Indices* of Migne's *Patrologia Graeca* (Paris, Garnier, 1912, pp. 218).

*The Early Roman Episcopate*, by William Ernest Beet (Charles H. Kelly), with the author's *Rise of the Papacy*, completes the history of the Roman Church from the establishment of Christianity to the close of the pontificate of Leo I.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: R. Pichon, *La Liberté de Conscience dans l'Ancienne Rome à propos du Seizième Centenaire de l'Edit de Milan* (*Revue des Deux Mondes*, July 15); L. Bertrand, *Saint Augustin*, I.-VI. (*ibid.*, April 1-June 15).

#### MEDIEVAL HISTORY

F. Schaub's *Studien zur Geschichte der Sklaverei im Frühmittelalter* is published as volume 44 of the *Abhandlungen zur Mittleren und Neueren Geschichte* (Berlin, Rothschild, 1913).

The Marquis d'Albon has edited the *Cartulaire Général de l'Ordre du Temple, 1119?-1150* (Paris, Champion, 1913, pp. xxiii, 473) which is printed in a limited edition of 200 copies.

The first issue of a series of *Mittelalterliche Studien* is *Humana Civiltas; Staat, Kirche, und Kultur; eine Dante-Untersuchung*, by Dr. Fritz Kern, privatdozent in the University of Kiel (Leipzig, Koehler, 1913, pp. xii, 146). Various medieval ideas and their form in the writings

of Dante are discussed, but special attention is given to the relations of Church and State.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: R. Grosse, *Das Römisch-Byzantinische Marschlager vom 4.-10. Jahrhundert* (Byzantinische Zeitschrift, XXII. 1); B. Schmeidler, *Der Briefwechsel zwischen Abälard und Heloise eine Fälschung?* (Archiv für Kulturgeschichte, XI. 1); G. Schlumberger, *Fin de la Domination Franque en Syrie: Prise de Saint-Jean d'Acre en l'An 1291 par l'Armée du Soudan d'Égypte* (Revue des Deux Mondes, July 15); Comte L. Voinovitch, *Les "Angevins" à Raguse, 1384-1385*, I, II. (Revue des Questions Historiques, April, July); G. Luzzatto, *Le Finanze di un Castello [Matelica] nel Sec. XIII.* (Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte, XI. 1); A. Dufourcq, *Les Origines de la Science Moderne d'après les Découvertes récentes* (Revue des Deux Mondes, July 15).

#### MODERN EUROPEAN HISTORY

General review: J. Hashagen, *Geschichte der Geistigen Kultur von der Mitte des 17. bis zum Ausgange des 18. Jahrhunderts*, I. (Archiv für Kulturgeschichte, XI. 2).

The history of the pontificate of *Adriano VI.* (Rome, Loescher, 1913) has been written by Guido Pasolini.

In the *Oesterreichische Staatsverträge*, the second volume for England covers the period from 1749 to October, 1813, with an appendix extending to April, 1847. The volume is edited by A. F. Pribram (Vienna, Holzhausen, 1913).

The importance of the electorate of Trier as the headquarters of the *Émigrés* is properly recognized by F. Liesenfeld in his *Klemens Wenzeslaus, der Letzte Kurfürst von Trier, seine Landstände und die Französische Revolution, 1789-1794* (Trier, Lintz, 1913).

*The Social Policy of Bismarck: a critical Study, with a Comparison of German and English Insurance Legislation*, by Annie Ashley, volume III. of the *Birmingham Studies in Social Economics and Adjacent Fields*, is an illuminating study of Bismarck's legislative policy.

In *Il Trentino nel Risorgimento* (Rome, Società ed. Dante Alighieri, 1913, pp. xi, 338, 330), L. Marchetti recounts the history, during the movement for Italian unity, of a region which is still Italia Irredenta. The fate of another district during the same period is the topic of J. Trésal's *L'Annexion de la Savoie à la France, 1848-1860* (Paris, Plon, 1913, pp. xxxviii, 359).

F. Charles-Roux's *Alexandre II., Gortchakoff, et Napoléon III.* (Paris, Plon, 1913) is a work of prime importance on international affairs from 1855 to 1870, based upon a considerable use of the French archives.

Hermann Hesselbarth has used 28 secret despatches of Bismarck, Prim, and others, which throw important new light upon the origin of the Franco-German War, as a basis for *Drei Psychologische Fragen zur Spanischen Thronkandidatur Leopolds von Hohenzollern* (Leipzig, Teubner, 1913).

A volume entitled *Les Aspirations Autonomistes en Europe* (Paris, Alcan, 1913, pp. xix, 377) contains a series of lectures, delivered about two years ago at the École des Hautes-Études Sociales, by nine individuals, on Albania, Alsace-Lorraine, Catalonia, Finland, the Greek islands, Ireland, Macedonia, Poland, and Croatia.

Professor A. Heisenberg of the University of Munich has given some account of the Philhellenic spirit as a factor in European affairs in *Der Philhellenismus einst und jetzt* (Munich, Beck, 1913, reviewed by A. Thumb, *Deutsche Rundschau*, June).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: P. Imbart de la Tour, *Érasme: l'Évangélisme Catholique* (*Revue des Deux Mondes*, May 15); C. Singer, *The Early History of Tobacco* (*Quarterly Review*, July); L. Wahrmund, *Die Kaiserliche Exklusive im Konklave Innocenz XIII. [1721]* (*Sitzungsberichte der k. Akademie der Wissenschaften [Vienna]*, CLXX.); W. Gohlke, *Die Leistungen der Feuerwaffen in den Feldzügen von 1740-1905* (*Preussische Jahrbücher*, May); L. G. Pélissier, *Autour des Négociations de Bâle, Juillet-Septembre, 1795* (*Revue Historique de la Révolution Française et de l'Empire*, April); C. T. Atkinson, *The Peninsular War* (*Quarterly Review*, July); G. Dickhuth, 1813, I.-V. (*Deutsche Rundschau*, March-July); C. Terlinden, *Le Conclave de Léon XII., 2-28 Septembre 1823, d'après des Documents inédits* (*Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique*, April); Général Palat, *La Mission du Général Boyer à Versailles, 1870* (*Revue de Paris*, July 15); É. Ollivier, *La Guerre de 1870* (*Revue des Deux Mondes*, July 15).

#### GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND

Fascicle 4 of vol. IX. of the *Ephemeris Epigraphica* not only gives recently discovered inscriptions, but a summary of present knowledge regarding the Roman occupation of Britain.

Mr. Arthur H. Lyell has collected *A Bibliographical List Descriptive of Romano-British Architectural Remains in Great Britain* (Cambridge University Press, pp. 156), arranged topographically, by counties, with an index.

The Clarendon Press has issued Professor Haverfield's *The Romanization of Roman Britain* (pp. 68).

The Cambridge University Press has issued *English Monasteries*, by A. Hamilton Thompson. Leaflet 32 of the English Historical Association is a study of the same subject by Miss Rose Graham, entitled *An Essay on English Monasteries*. It deals with the work of the monks and

canons as builders, as historians, and as dispensers of revenue from 1066 to the middle of the fourteenth century.

H. P. Stokes, in his *Studies in Anglo-Jewish History*, deals first with the general history of the Jews in England between 1070 and 1290, then with the Jews of Cambridge.

In the series of *Yale Historical Publications* S. K. Mitchell is soon to publish *Studies in Taxation under John and Henry III.*

The Selden Society has issued volume III. of the *Eyre of Kent, 6 and 7 Edward II.*

*The York Memorandum Book*, part I., 1376-1419, edited by Maud Sellers (Surtees Society, vol. CXX., 1912) is particularly rich in gild regulations, since in York as in no other city was gild organization developed.

The Canterbury and York Society mention that the Registers of Bishop J. de Halton of Carlisle, and the Rolls of Bishop Grosseteste will soon be completed. It is also probable that part of Archbishop Parker's Register, and *Visitations of Religious Houses, 1420-1426*, by A. Hamilton Thompson, will soon be distributed.

Messrs. Longmans, Green, and Company announce for publication in the near future *The Reign of Henry VII. from Contemporary Sources*, selected and arranged by A. F. Pollard.

Longmans, Green, and Company have announced *A History of England from the Defeat of the Armada to the Death of Elizabeth, with an Account of English Institutions during the Later Sixteenth and the Early Seventeenth Centuries*, by Professor E. P. Cheyney of the University of Pennsylvania.

Mr. E. V. Portus's *Caritas Anglicana* (Mowbray) is a study of the religious and philanthropic societies working in England between 1678 and 1740.

Two interesting economic and social studies in English history that have recently appeared are *The English Housewife in the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries* (Arnold), by Miss Rose M. Bradley, and *The English Scene in the Eighteenth Century*, by E. S. Roscoe, a general survey of social conditions.

Among the announcements of John Lane is *Philip, Duke of Wharton*, by Lewis Melville.

*Horace Walpole's World*, by Miss Alice Drayton Greenwood (Macmillan), is a fairly successful picture of its period, the materials being drawn from Walpole's own correspondence and from the publications of the Historical Manuscripts Commission.

Professor E. Dolléans, of the University of Dijon, has published a two-volume history of *Le Chartisme, 1830-1848* (Paris, Floury, 1913).

A second edition of the *Letters of Lord Acton to Mary, Daughter of the Right Hon. W. E. Gladstone*, edited by Herbert Paul, has appeared (Macmillan and Company), containing twenty-six additional letters.

Volume I. of *A Modern History of the English People*, by R. H. Getten (Boston, Small, Maynard, and Company) deals with the period 1880-1898. The work promises to be a useful reference book.

*The Making of Modern England*, by Gilbert Slater (Houghton Mifflin Company), is an attempt to make clear the economic conditions of England to-day by a survey of social and economic conditions of the past.

The Houghton Mifflin Company has recently published *The Nation and the Empire*, by Lord Milner, mostly addresses.

Sidney and Beatrice Webb have added to their studies in economic history *English Local Government: the Story of the King's Highway* (London, Longmans).

Professor Gonner's *Common Land and Inclosure* (Macmillan) is a study of the effect of inclosure on movements of wealth and population.

English economic history has received a contribution, written with both scholarship and insight, in *English Farming Past and Present* (Longmans, 1912, pp. 504), by Rowland E. Prothero, agent-in-chief to the Duke of Bedford.

Among the announcements of forthcoming books from the press of Messrs. Longmans is *The Rise of South Africa: a History of the Origin of South African Colonization and of its Development towards the East from the Earliest Times to 1857* by Professor G. E. Cory.

British government publications: *Calendar of the Patent Rolls*, Henry III., A. D. 1266-1272; *Calendar of Inquisitions Post Mortem and Other Analogous Documents*, vol. IV., Edward I.; *Calendar of State Papers, Ireland*, 1669-1670; *Register of the Privy Council of Scotland*, third series, vol. V., A. D. 1676-1678, ed. P. Hume Brown.

Other documentary publications: *Calendar of the Letter-Books of the City of London: Letter-Book L, temp. Edward IV.-Henry VII.*, ed. Reginald R. Sharpe (London, Guildhall); *Lincoln Episcopal Records in the Time of Thomas Cooper, S.T.P., Bishop of Lincoln, A. D. 1571 to A. D. 1584*, ed. C. W. Foster (Lincoln Record Society and the Canterbury and York Society); *Diocesis Wyntoniensis, Registrum Johannis de Pontissara Pars Prima* (Canterbury and York Society, XXXIII.); *Diocesis Herefordensis, Registrum Thome de Charlton* (Canterbury and York Society, XXXIV.)

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: P. Hume Brown, *Four Representative Documents of Scottish History* (Scottish Historical Review, July); H. W. C. Davis, *The Anglo-Saxon Laws* (English Historical Review, July); R. L. Poole, *The Publication of Great Charters by the English*

*Kings* (*ibid.*); Theodora Keith, *The Origin of the Convention of the Royal Burghs: with a Note on the Connection of the Chamberlain with the Burghs* (Scottish Historical Review, July); Theodora Keith, *The Trading Privileges of the Royal Burghs of Scotland*, I. (English Historical Review, July); H. Dibbelt, *Oliver Cromwells Toleranz* (Neue Jahrbücher, XXXI. 5); C. H. Firth, *Some Seventeenth Century Diaries and Memoirs* (Scottish Historical Review, July); *Social Life in Ireland under the Restoration* (Edinburgh Review, April); W. L. Grant, *A Puritan at the Court of Louis XIV.* [Denzil Holles] (Bulletin of the Departments of History, etc., in Queen's University, Kingston, Canada); A. M. Schlesinger, *Colonial Appeals to the Privy Council*, I. (Political Science Quarterly, June); W. R. Scott, *The Trade of Orkney at the End of the Eighteenth Century* (Scottish Historical Review, July); W. J. Ashley, *Comparative Economic History and the English Landlord* (The Economic Journal, June).

#### FRANCE

General reviews: G. Pagès, *Histoire Extérieure du Second Empire* (Revue des Études Napoléoniennes, July); R. Guyot, *Histoire de France: Époque Contemporaine* (Revue Historique, July).

*The Making of the Nations: France*, by Cecil Headlam (London, Adam and Charles Black, pp. viii, 408) is a skillful condensation of French history admirably fitted to the purposes of the series.

In 1886 the first six books of Gregory of Tours's *Historia Francorum* were edited from the Corbie manuscript by H. Omont as the second volume of the *Collection de Textes pour Servir à l'Étude et à l'Enseignement de l'Histoire*. In 1893 the four additional books were edited from the Brussels manuscript by G. Collon as the thirteenth volume of the same series. Both are now out of print, and a new edition has been prepared for the series by R. Poupardin, which combines the whole ten books in a single volume (Paris, Picard, 1913, pp. xxx, 501). Various minor corrections and improvements have been introduced, and an index is added.

In *Les Origines du Servage en France* (Paris, Lecoffre, 1913) the author, Paul Allard, develops as his salient point the idea that serfdom should be studied as an achievement in the struggle for freedom.

Professor A. Cartellieri, of the University of Jena, has published in pamphlet form his address before the recent International Congress of History at London, on *Philipp II. August und der Zusammenbruch des Angevinischen Reiches* (Leipzig, Dyksche Buchhandlung, 1913, pp. 16). The address is an interesting foretaste of a future volume of his history of Philip Augustus.

M. Artonne has recently published *Le Mouvement de 1314, et les Chartes Provinciales de 1315* (Paris, Alcan).

E. Maugis deals with the period of the Valois kings in the first volume of his *Histoire du Parlement de Paris de l'Avènement des Rois Valois à la Mort de Henri IV.* (Paris, Picard, 1913, pp. xxvii, 735).

F. M. Graves has edited for the *Bibliothèque du XV<sup>e</sup> Siècle*, *Quelques Pièces relatives à la Vie de Louis I., Duc d'Orléans, et de Valentine Visconti, sa Femme* (Paris, Champion, 1913, pp. xii, 321).

In *Une Grande Famille Parlementaire: les d'Orgemont, leur Origine, leur Fortune, le Boiteux d'Orgemont* (Paris, Champion) the author, Léon Mirot, has first traced the history of the family, then studied in detail the life of one member of that family, Nicolas d'Orgemont, who died in prison in 1416.

W. Heubi has sought, in *François I<sup>er</sup> et le Mouvement Intellectuel en France* (Lausanne, 1913, pp. 157, reviewed by G. Baguenault de Puchesse, *Revue des Questions Historiques*, July), to interpret matters favorably for the personal character and influence of that king. His fundamental assumption is that the steady policy of Francis I. was to effect the separation of the Renaissance and of Protestantism, for he was a loyal Catholic though a Gallican.

The latest volume from the pen of Louis Batiffol on the reign of Louis XIII. is *La Duchesse de Chevreuse: une Vie d'Aventures et d'Intrigues sous Louis XIII.* (Paris, Hachette, 1913, pp. vi, 310). The bibliography of manuscript and printed materials testifies to the scholarly researches of the author, and his style combines readableness with the restrained and judicial tone becoming to a good historian. Naturally the bulk of the narrative deals with the period from the marriage with the Duke of Chevreuse in 1622 till the withdrawal of the duchess from Paris in 1652, and its historical interest centres in the intrigues against Richelieu and Mazarin.

The *Writings* of James Breck Perkins, consisting of *France under Mazarin*, *France under Louis XV.*, *France under the Regency*, and *France in the American Revolution*, six volumes in all, have been published in a new uniform edition by Houghton Mifflin.

The third issue of the series *L'Histoire par les Contemporains* is *Les Querelles Parlementaires sous Louis XV.* (Paris, Hachette, 1913, pp. ii, 112), edited by Leon Cahen, who is in charge of the series. Like its two predecessors, it is a volume of well-chosen selections from the original sources and the contemporary narratives.

In the series called *Recueil des Instructions données aux Ambassadeurs et Ministres de France*, the French government has just published (Alcan) the third volume, 1724-1791, of M. Gabriel Hanotaux's section for Rome. The fourth and last volume will appear in 1914.

Dr. Paul Metzger has published in the *Annales de l'Université de Lyon* a careful and valuable *Contribution à l'Étude de Deux Réformes*



*Judiciaires au XVIII<sup>e</sup> Siècle: le Conseil Supérieur et le Grand Bailliage de Lyon, 1771-1774, 1788* (Paris, Picard, 1913, pp. 446). The volume is based almost exclusively upon painstaking researches in the archives, and is a constructive work of genuine importance, for it is an intimate study of the actual workings of these two attempts at judicial reform under the old régime, in a single locality.

Dr. Gustave Le Bon's remarkable work on *La Révolution Française et la Psychologie des Révolutions* has been translated into English and published by Messrs. Putnam under the title *The Psychology of Revolution*.

The central commission and departmental committees for publishing documents on the economic history of the French Revolution have now been in operation nine years. In February, 1913, under ministerial authority, a general assembly of all the members of these bodies was convened at the Sorbonne. In accordance with a methodical programme set forth well in advance, "experience meetings" on the various branches of the work were held, with pronounced success. The discussions, highly profitable for Americans to consider, are reported briefly in the *Revue d'Histoire Moderne et Contemporaine* for March-April, and will be published in full in the commission's *Bulletin*.

C. Perroud is the editor of the first volume of a new series of the *Correspondance* of Madame Roland, which has just appeared in the *Collection de Documents inédits* (Paris, Leroux, 1913).

Mr. W. J. Dixon is preparing a study on *Marat, Marie de Corday and the Girondins* for early publication.

*Fouquier-Tinville* (Paris, Perrin), by Alphonse Dunoyer, is a contribution to the history of the Terror from the documents in the National Archives.

A small volume on Robespierre by the Swedish historian Johannes Heüman attempts to show Robespierre as the great idealist of the Revolution. *Le Procès du Neuf Thermidor* (Paris, Bloud), by André Godard, also argues the case of Robespierre, with much originality, though not conclusively.

Colónel Frignet-Despréaux has published the first volume of a life of his great-uncle, *La Maréchal Mortier, Duc de Trévise, d'après des Papiers de Famille inédits* (Paris, Berger-Levrault, 1913, pp. viii, 453). The narrative is carried down to 1797.

The *Mémoires de A. C. Thibaudeau, 1799-1815* (Paris, Plon, 1913, pp. iv, 561, reviewed by A. Aulard, *La Révolution Française*, July), are entirely distinct from any previously published work of the author, and though written in 1843, were based on his notes and other contemporary papers. With some reservations about the editorial work, Professor Aulard regards them as "the most important and the most instructive of all that have been published on the epoch of the Consulate and the Empire".

Duffield and Company are soon to issue three volumes of unpublished correspondence by Napoleon, edited by Lieut.-Col. Ernest Picard and translated by Mrs. Louise Seymour Houghton.

Under the title *Vingt-Cinq Ans à Paris, 1826-1850*, E. Daudet has published the first two volumes (to 1834) of the *Journal* of Count Rudolf Apponyi (Paris, 1913), who was an attaché of the Austro-Hungarian embassy at Paris.

E. P. Bottinelli has edited the *Souvenirs* (Paris, Hachette, 1913, pp. xxxviii, 266, reviewed by A. Aulard, *La Révolution Française*, August) written by Cournot in 1859, when he was rector of the academy at Dijon. The *Souvenirs* are quite impersonal and are of unusual value for the light which they throw upon the history of education, of culture, and of ideas, in the eighteenth as well as in the nineteenth century.

A. Claveau, for many years a secretary of the Chamber of Deputies, has published the first volume of his *Souvenirs Politiques et Parlementaires d'un Témoin* (Paris, Plon, 1913, pp. iii, 531). The volume includes only the period from 1865 to 1870, thus indicating that several volumes will probably be necessary to cover the author's long official career.

In the March-April number (pages 165-166) of the *Revue d'Histoire Moderne et Contemporaine*, M. Pierre Caron has replied to the note in the January number of this journal (p. 426) on *Les Origines Diplomatiques de la Guerre de 1870-1871*, explaining in detail that the omitted documents are "irrelevant materials" and protesting against "the natural suspicion . . . that the meat is withheld and only the shucks given". It is most gratifying to be so convincingly reassured of the entire good faith of the publication "qu'il porte sur l'intégralité des documents conservés aux Affaires Étrangères". The seventh volume of this publication has just appeared and contains documents for the period from September 1, 1865, to March 14, 1866 (Paris, Ficker, 1913, pp. 491).

The career of one of the most influential politicians and journalists of the Third Republic is depicted in *Ranc, Souvenirs, Correspondance, 1831-1908* (Paris, Cornély, 1913, pp. viii, 524, reviewed by A. Aulard, *La Révolution Française*, July). E. Petit has written a life of *Eugène Pelletan, 1813-1884* (Paris, Quillet, 1913, pp. xv, 283), and Monsignor Laveille, of *Chesnelong, 1820-1899* (Paris, Lethielleux, 1913, pp. xvi, 632).

An excellent *Bibliographie Lorraine*, reviewing the publications of 1911 and 1912, is published as the third part of the twenty-sixth volume of the *Annales de l'Est* (Paris, Berger-Levrault, 1912, pp. 256).

The question of Morocco has brought out a number of volumes, of which a few of the more important are Professor A. Bernard's *Le Maroc* (Paris, Alcan, 1913); E. Dupuy's *Comment nous avons conquis le Maroc, 1845-1912* (Paris, Roger, 1913, pp. 400); P. Albin's *La*

*Querelle Franco-Allemande; le Coup d'Agadir* (Paris, Alcan, 1912, pp. iii, 396); P. Khorat's *En Colonne au Maroc* (Paris, Perrin, 1913); and Colonel Sainte-Chapelle's *La Conquête du Maroc, Mai 1911-Mars 1913* (Paris, Berger-Levrault, 1913). René Millet has treated a different phase of the problem in *La Conquête du Maroc: la Question Indigène* (Paris, Perrin, 1913).

A life of *Waldeck-Rousseau, l'Homme, l'Avocat, l'Orateur Parlementaire, le Premier Ministre* has been written by Paul Raynaud (Paris, Grasset, 1913).

The first account of Captain Marchand's expedition, which was made famous by the Fashoda affair, has been published by Dr. J. Émily, the physician of the party, in *Mission Marchand; Journal de Route* (Paris, Hachette, 1913). The work is already in its second edition.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: G. Lizerand, *Les Dépositions du Grand Maître Jacques de Molay au Procès des Templiers, 1307-1314* (Le Moyen Age, March); J. Viard, *Itinéraire de Philippe VI. de Valois, I.* (Bibliothèque de l'École de Chartes, January); P. de Vaissière, *Le Baron des Adrets, 1512-1586, I., II.* (Revue des Questions Historiques, April, July); P. van Dyke, *The Estates of Pontoise* (English Historical Review, July); P. Gachon, *Les Biens des Églises Protestants en 1685 et les Oeuvres Pies* (Annales du Midi, July); M. Marion, *Grèves et Rentrées Judiciaires au XVIII<sup>e</sup> Siècle: le Grand Exil du Parlement de Besançon, 1759-1761* (Revue des Questions Historiques, July); G. Weulersse, *Les Physiocrates et la Question du Pain Cher au Milieu du XVIII<sup>e</sup> Siècle, 1756-1770* (Revue du Dix-huitième Siècle, April); Baron de Contenson, *L'Ordre Américain de Cincinnatus en France, 1783* (Revue d'Histoire Diplomatique, 1913, 2); A. Aulard, *La Féodalité sous la Révolution, Survivance, Vicissitudes, Suppression, I., II.* (La Révolution Française, July, August); G. K. Fortescue, *The French Revolution in Contemporary Literature* (Quarterly Review, April); N. Karéiev, *Deux Opinions Contraires sur l'Histoire Agraire de la France à l'Époque de la Révolution* [Loutchisky and Kovalevsky] (La Révolution Française, June); Général Camon, *Le Système de Guerre de Napoléon: la Manœuvre sur Position Centrale* (Revue des Études Napoléoniennes, July); R. Villatte des Prunes, *Les Effectifs de la Grande Armée pour la Campagne de Russie de 1812* (Revue des Études Historiques, May); G. Lote, *Napoléon et le Romantisme Français* (Romanische Forschungen, XXXIII. 1); Comte Boulay de la Meurthe, *Le Duc de Rovigo à Vincennes* (Revue des Études Napoléoniennes, July); C. Benoist, *L'Homme de 1848, I., Comment il s'est Formé l'Initiation Révolutionnaire, 1830-1840* (Revue des Deux Mondes, July 1).

#### ITALY, SPAIN, AND PORTUGAL

The first volume of an *Annuario Bibliografico d'Archeologia e di Storia dell'Arte per l'Italia* is compiled by F. Gatti and F. Pellati and is published by the house of Loescher and Company of Rome. More

than 3,700 books, monographs and articles, both Italian and foreign, published during 1911, are listed and indexed. The same house has recently undertaken three useful bibliographical publications, which furnish lists of the works, both Italian and foreign, which appeared during the year 1912, in their respective fields. These are *Bibliografia Storica Italiana*; *Bibliografia Giuridico-Sociale*; and *Folklore Italiano*. It also publishes *Lares*, *Bollettino della Società di Etnografia Italiana*, which began in 1912, under the editorship of Lamberto Loria.

Two assistant professors in the University of Naples, V. Macchioro and L. Correrà, have begun the publication of an attractively printed and illustrated quarterly, *Neapolis, Rivista di Archeologia, Epigrafia, e Numismatica*, which will take as its special field southern Italy and Sicily. The subscription price for foreign countries is twenty lire.

Two books dealing with the same subject, to which they add little or nothing new, are *The Story of the Borgias*, by John Fyvie (Putnam), and *Caesar Borgia: a Study of the Renaissance*, by John Leslie Garner (McBride, Nast, and Company).

The fourth and final volume of Cesare Pinzi's *Storia della Città di Viterbo lungo il Medioevo, illustrata con Note e Documenti in gran parte inediti* (Viterbo, Agnesotti, 1913) carries the narrative from 1436 down to the death of Clement VII. in 1534. The earlier volumes appeared in 1887, 1889, and 1899.

An account of the Spanish and Austrian rule at Milan is furnished by A. Visconti's *La Pubblica Amministrazione nello Stato Milanese durante il Predominio Straniero, 1541-1796* (Rome, Loescher, 1913).

Students of local Italian history will find *Les Déplacements de Souveraineté en Italie pendant les Guerres du XVIII<sup>e</sup> Siècle*, by M. Irénée Lameire (Paris, Rousseau, 1911, pp. viii, 538) of service and interest.

The Spanish School of Archaeology and History at Rome, founded in 1910, under the direction of Don José Pijoán, has begun the publication of a series of *Cuadernos de Trabajos* (Madrid, 1912). The long and intimate connections of Spain with Italy furnish a wide field of investigation in which comparatively little work has been done.

Fritz Baer is the author of a volume of *Studien zur Geschichte der Juden im Königreich Aragonien während des 13. und 14. Jahrhunderts* (Berlin, Ebering, 1913).

Don J. B. Sitges has made an important contribution to the fifteenth-century history of Spain and thrown much light on the early life of Isabella in his *Don Enrique IV. y la Excelente Señora, llamada vulgarmente Doña Juana la Beltraneja, 1425-1530* (Madrid, 1912, pp. 467, reviewed by J. Juderías in *Revista de Archivos, Bibliotecas, y Museos*, March).

Among the many evidences of a revival of Spanish interest in America is the recent organization of an Instituto de Estudios Americanistas in Seville, which began in March the publication of a quarterly *Boletín*; it is also to serve as an organ for the Archives of the Indies, and for the Faculty of Philosophy and Letters of the University of Seville. The opening number of the *Boletín* contains, in addition to several interesting historical articles, accounts of the Americanist movement in Spain, and of the Archives of the Indies. The foreign subscription price is fifteen francs.

Some account of the recent political developments in Portugal may be found in Dr. G. Diercks's *Das Moderne Portugal* (Berlin, Paetel, 1913, pp. 355).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: G. Marchetti-Longhi, *La Legazione in Lombardia di Gregorio da Monte Longo negli anni 1238-1251*, I. (Archivio della R. Società Romana di Storia Patria, XXXVI. 1); C. L. Laderchi, *Battaglia di Guastalla, 19 Settembre 1734* (Nuova Antologia, August 1); F. D. Olmo, *La Rivoluzione Francese in Piemonte* (Rivista d'Italia, April 13); A. Vigevano, *L'Impresa Garibaldina del 1860 secondo i Telegrammi Pontifici* (Nuova Antologia, July 1); A. Sassi, *Notizie e Documenti per la Storia dell' Ultima Insurrezione Romana, 1867-1869* (Archivio della R. Società Romana di Storia Patria, XXXVI. 1); L. Klüpfel, *Die Beamten der Aragonischen Hof- und Zentralfinanzverwaltung am Ausgange des 13. Jahrhunderts* (Vierteljahrsschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte, XI. 1); L. Delavaud, *Lettres de S. A. R. Marie-Antoinette-Thérèse, Princesse des Asturies, à Madame de Mandell*, I. (Revue des Études Napoléoniennes, July); J. P. de Guzmán, *Apuntes para la Historia Contemporánea: los Manifiestos a la Nación, 1834-1875* (La España Moderna, July).

#### GERMANY, AUSTRIA, AND SWITZERLAND

German antiquities prior to the Völkerwanderung are treated in the first volume of F. Kauffmann's *Deutsche Altertumskunde* (Munich, Beck, 1913).

P. Kalkoff has described one of the most interesting episodes in the life of Luther and discussed its historical and religious significance in *Die Entstehung des Wormser Edikts: eine Geschichte des Wormser Reichstags vom Standpunkt der Lutherischen Frage* (Leipzig, Heinsius, 1913).

The Historical Commission of the Bavarian Academy of Sciences, at its session in May, decided to undertake the preparation of a catalogue of materials, especially south German, for the history of trade to the close of the sixteenth century, as a preliminary step to later publication work in the field of German economic history.

The seventh volume of Professor Riezler's *Geschichte Bayerns* (Gotha, Perthes, 1913) deals with the period from 1650 to 1704. Under

the editorship of K. A. von Müller there has recently appeared a *Riezler-Festschrift, Beiträge zur Bayerischen Geschichte* (Gotha, Perthes, 1913).

A life of *Hans Karl vom Winterfeldt*, the chief of staff to Frederick the Great, has been written by Lieutenant-General A. von Janson (Berlin, Stilke, 1913, pp. xii, 449).

Two notable contributions to the history of Baden have recently appeared: Lenel's *Badens Rechtsverwaltung und Rechtsverfassung unter Markgraf Karl Friedrich, 1738-1803* (Karlsruhe, Braun, 1913), and Andreas's *Geschichte der Badischen Verwaltungsorganisation und Verfassung in den Jahren 1802-1818* (vol. I., Leipzig, Quelle and Meyer, 1913).

In addition to Professor J. von Pflugk-Harttung's *Das Befreiungsjahr, 1813, aus den Akten des Geheimen Staatsarchivs* (Berlin, Union Deutsche Verlagsgesellschaft, 1913), the more notable recent contributions to the history of Germany during the Napoleonic period include a volume of facsimiles, with notes and comments, entitled *Urkunden der Deutschen Erhebung*, edited by Dr. Friedrich Schulze (Leipzig, Merseburger, 1913); the first part, which treats of the diplomatic relations, of M. Pflüger's *Koalitions-Politik; Metternich und Friedrich von Gentz, 1804-1806* (Hamburg, Rademacher, 1913, pp. 101); and the second volume of P. Pietsch's *Die Formation- und Uniformierungsgeschichte des Preussischen Heeres, 1808-1910* (Berlin, Verlag für Nationale Litteratur, 1913, pp. vii, 275), which deals with the cavalry and the artillery.

An important phase of the growth of constitutionalism in Germany during the nineteenth century is the subject of *Die Grundrechte vom Wiener Kongress bis zur Gegenwart* (Breslau, Marcus, 1913) by E. Eckhardt.

The ups and downs of the movement of political thought in Germany during the revolutionary years 1848 and 1849 could scarcely be better illustrated than by the comparison of the various constitutional projects. This has been admirably done in a little pamphlet, suited for illustrative use in classes, by Dr. Ludwig Bergstrasser, privatdozent at the University of Greifswald, under the title *Die Verfassung des Deutschen Reiches vom Jahre 1849, mit Vorentwürfen, Gegenvorschlägen, und Modificationen bis zum Erfurter Parlament* (Bonn, Marcus and Weber, 1913, pp. 104).

Professor F. Meinecke has completed Paul Hassel's *Joseph Maria vom Radowitz* by a volume entitled *Radowitz und die Deutsche Revolution* (Berlin, Mittler, 1913), which deals with the active later years of the friend and minister of Frederick William IV.

Professor Spenser Wilkinson has published in a pamphlet of 28 pages (Clarendon Press, 1913) *The Early Life of Moltke*, a lecture delivered before the University of Oxford last May and abounding in interest.

*Das Grosse Hauptquartier und die Deutschen Operationen im Zweiten Teil des Krieges, 1870-1871*, by Ludwig Biergans (Munich, Beck, 1913), continues, from the battle of Sedan, the work with similar title by Edward Friedrich. The volume contains 52 maps.

A survey of the present German political situation from the French viewpoint is furnished by W. Martin in a little volume on *La Crise Politique de l'Allemagne Contemporaine* (Paris, Alcan, 1913).

A recent contribution on the Prussian Polish question is *Die Ausbreitung der Polen in Preussen* (Leipzig, Hirschfeld, 1913) by W. Mitscherlich.

The reign of Ottocar I., 1198-1230, supplies the documents for the second volume of the *Codex Diplomaticus et Epistolaris Regni Bohemiae*, edited by G. Friedrich (Prague, Rivnáč, 1913).

Eduard von Wertheimer has completed *Graf Julius Andrássy: sein Leben und seine Zeit, nach ungedruckten Quellen* (Stuttgart, Deutsche Verlagsanstalt, 1913, pp. xx, 420; xiv, 374). The second volume carries the narrative to the secret convention of January 15, 1877, and the third volume deals with the last years and the characterization of the Austro-Hungarian minister of foreign affairs who joined with Bismarck in laying the foundations of the Triple Alliance.

The Council of Constance came within the period, 1384-1436, allotted to the third volume of the *Regesten zur Geschichte der Bischöfe von Constanx*, which is in course of publication under the editorship of K. Rieder (Innsbruck, Wagner, 1913).

The important period from 1813 to 1830 is covered in the second volume of Wilhelm Oechsli's excellent *Geschichte der Schweiz im Neunzehnten Jahrhundert* (Leipzig, Hirzel, 1913, pp. xix, 848, reviewed by G. Meyer von Knorau, *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen*, June). The volume is the thirtieth in the series, *Staatengeschichte der Neuesten Zeit*.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: K. Eymer, *Cäsar und Tacitus über die Germanen, Materialien, besonders für einen vergleichenden Rückblick nach der Lektüre der Germania* (*Neue Jahrbücher*, XXXII. 1); H. Niese, *Ueber die Register Friedrichs II.* (*Archiv für Urkundenforschung*, V. 1); E. E. Stengel, *Fuldensia*, I., *Die Urkundenfälschungen des Rudolf von Fulda* (*ibid.*); A. Werminghoff, *Die Urkunden Ludwigs des Bayern für den Hochmeister des Deutschen Ordens vom Jahre 1337* (*ibid.*); W. Köhler, *Grisars Luther*, I., II. (*Deutsche Literaturzeitung*, June 21, 28); Preserved Smith, *Luther's Early Development in the Light of Psycho-Analysis* (*American Journal of Psychology*, July); H. Grisar, *Prinzipienfragen Moderner Lutherforschung* (*Stimmen aus Maria-Laach*, 1912, 10); *id.*, *Lutherstimmungen der Gegenwart* (*ibid.*, 1913, 1-2); *id.*, *Lutherstimmung und Kritik: ein Lutherwort als Schulbeispiel* (*ibid.*, 1913, 3); *id.*, *Walther Köhler über Luther und die Lüge* (*Historisches Jahrbuch*, 34, 1); S. Merkle, *Würzburg im Zeitalter der*



*Aufklärung* (Archiv für Kulturgeschichte, XI. 2); Feldmarschall Freiherr von der Goltz, *Scharnhorst* (Velhagen and Klasings Monatshefte, May); F. Meinecke, *Stein und die Erhebung von 1813* (Kunstwart und Kulturwart, XXVI. 15); T. Bitterauf, *Zur Geschichte der Oeffentlichen Meinung im Königreich Bayern im Jahre 1813 bis zum Abschluss des Vertrages von Ried* (Archiv für Kulturgeschichte, XI. 1).

#### NETHERLANDS AND BELGIUM

Arnold Norlind has made an interesting contribution to the peculiar historical geography of the Netherlands in *Die Geographische Entwicklung des Rheindeltas bis zum Jahr 1500: eine Historisch-Geographische Studie* (Amsterdam, Van Schaick, 1912, pp. xviii, 272).

In *Het Bijbelsch Humanisme in Nederland* (Leyden, A. H. Adriani, 1913, pp. viii, 280) Dr. J. Lindeboom follows out, with adequate scholarship and intelligence though without brilliancy, the useful task of tracing, through the period of the Reformation in the Netherlands, the activities and influence of that series of humanists, moderate Catholic reformers in some cases, moderate Protestant reformers in most, who steadily furthered theological enlightenment by applying the best classical and humanistic scholarship to the study of the Bible. For the most part they can be classed as assistants or continuators of the work of Erasmus.

The latest issue, series V., vol. 2, of the *Archives ou Correspondance inédite de la Maison d'Orange-Nassau* is edited by F. J. L. Kramer, and includes materials for the years 1779-1782 (Leyden, Sijthoff, 1913).

#### NORTHERN AND EASTERN EUROPE

The sixth of the annual issues of *Islandica* published by the Cornell University Library as possessor of the Fiske Icelandic collection is a bibliography of Icelandic authors of to-day by Mr. Halldór Hermannsson, with an appended list of books and essays relating to modern Icelandic literature, since the Reformation.

In the first volume of *Russlands Orientpolitik in den letzten zwei Jahrhunderten* (Stuttgart, Deutsche Verlagsanstalt, 1913) H. Uebersberger deals with eighteenth-century affairs down to the treaty of Jassy in 1792.

Pierre Rain's *Un Tsar Idéologue; Alexandre I<sup>er</sup>, 1777-1825* (Paris, Perrin, 1913, pp. 460, reviewed by E. Denis, *La Révolution Française*, July) is, as the title implies, a somewhat popular history of the reign, written as a psychological study.

Professor Theodor Schiemann has studied the Polish insurrection of 1830 and the diplomatic struggles with England and France over the Eastern Question from 1830 to 1840 in the third volume of his *Geschichte Russlands unter Kaiser Nikolaus I.* (Berlin, Reimer, 1913).

The political activities of one of the most important Roumanian

families are recounted by Alexandre A. C. Stourdza in *L'Europe Orientale et le Rôle Historique des Maurocordato, 1660-1830; avec un Appendice contenant des Actes et Documents Historiques et Diplomatiques inédits* (Paris, Plon, 1913).

Lieutenant-Colonel Freiherr von Tettau, who accompanied the Russian army during the war with Japan, and who translated into German the history of the war by the Russian general staff, has now undertaken to write *Kuropatkin und seine Unterführer: Kritik und Lehren des Russisch-Japanischen Krieges*. The first volume has appeared, which traces Kuropatkin's career from his early exploit at Geok-Tepe down to the battle of Liao Yang (Berlin, Mittler, 1913, pp. x, 361).

Dr. Bernard Stambler has written of the Roumanian Jews and of their position under international law in *L'Histoire des Israélites Roumains et le Droit d'Intervention* (Paris, Pedone, 1913).

Professors L. von Thalloczy, C. Jireček, and E. von Sufflay have published the first volume of *Acta et Diplomata Res Albaniae Mediae Aetatis illustrantia* (Vienna, Holzhausen, 1913).

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: A. Bugge, *Altschwedische Gilden* (Vierteljahrschrift für Sozial- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte, XI. 1); E. W. Brooks, *The Arab Occupation of Crete* (English Historical Review, July); E. Darkó, *Die Letzten Geschichtschreiber von Byzanz* (Ungarische Rundschau, April); M. Lyubavsky, *The Accession of the Romanovs, March 3, 1613, in the History of Russia* (Russian Review, February); anon., *Der "Allgemeine Jüdische Arbeiterbund" zur Zeit der Russischen Revolution, 1904-1907* (Archiv für Sozialwissenschaft und Sozialpolitik, May); S. Prokopowitsch, *Ueber die Bedingungen der Industriellen Entwicklung Russlands* (ibid., Ergänzungsheft X.); G. Khrustalyev-Nosar, *The Council of Workmen Deputies* (Russian Review, February); H. Vimard, *Les Juifs en Pologne Russe* (Revue de Paris, August 1); H. Williams, *The Case of the Letts* (Russian Review, February); G. Bodenstein, *Das Statut der Belgrader "Deutschenstadt" von 1724* (Ungarische Rundschau, April); D. von Szegh, *Die Grenzen Albaniens* (ibid.); R. Pinon, *La Liquidation de la Turquie d'Europe* (Revue des Deux Mondes, June 15); C. Vellay, *La Question Arménienne* (Revue de Paris, June 1).

#### THE FAR EAST

The first number of *Geist des Ostens, Monatsschrift zur Asiaten-kunde* (Munich, Verlag des Ostens) has recently appeared.

*The Memoirs of Li Hung-Chang*, edited by W. F. Mannix, with an introduction by Hon. John W. Foster, is to appear this fall from the press of the Houghton Mifflin Company.

An authorized French translation of *Niku-Dan* (Mitraille Humaine), a personal narrative of the siege of Port Arthur by Lieutenant Tadeyoshi

Sakurai, has appeared, with an introduction by Marshal Oyama and a preface by Count Okuma (Paris, Challamel, 1913, pp. 378). The volume has attained the remarkable popularity of more than sixty editions in Japan. A Russian account of *La Défense de Port Arthur* by Colonels A. von Schwarz and G. Romanovski has also been translated into French by J. Lepoivre (Paris, Berger-Levrault, 1912-1913, pp. 652, 459).

*La Chine et le Mouvement Constitutionnel, 1910-1911* (Paris, Alcan, 1913) by J. Rodes, is one of the recent publications on contemporary developments in China.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: E. B. Drew, *Sir Robert Hart and his Life Work in China* (Journal of Race Development, July); Katherine A. Carl, *A Personal Estimate of the Character of the Late Empress Dowager, Tze-Hsi* (*ibid.*); O. Hoetzsch, *Russisch-Turkestan und die Tendenzen der heutigen Russischen Kolonialpolitik*, I. (Schmoller's Jahrbuch für Gesetzgebung, Verwaltung, und Volkswirtschaft im Deutschen Reiche, XXXVII. 2).

## AMERICA

### GENERAL ITEMS

The Department of Historical Research in the Carnegie Institution of Washington expects that in 1914 Professor William I. Hull of Swarthmore College will proceed under its auspices to the Netherlands, with whose archives he is already familiar by several months of investigation, to make a systematic and comprehensive guide to the materials for American history in the various Dutch archives; Professor Frank A. Golder of the Washington State College will execute a similar mission in the archives of Russia. It is hoped also that further investigations in the Archives of the Indies may be prosecuted. Professor Faust has concluded his examination of the archives of Vienna, Salzburg, and the German cantons of Switzerland. His report will take the form of a guide similar to those heretofore published by the Department, incorporating the notes which the director of the Department obtained in the archives of the French cantons last summer. Of the four volumes produced by this Department which the Institution now has in press—Mr. Parker's for Canadian archives, Professor Bolton's for those of Mexico, that of Dr. Paullin and Professor Paxson for those of Great Britain, of the period since 1783, and Professor Andrews's last volume for the earlier period—the first two are nearly ready for issue, while the making of the index to the third is approaching its completion.

Professor Ephraim D. Adams's Dodge lectures will be published by the Yale University Press under the title *The Power of Ideals in American History*.

*National Supremacy: Treaty Power versus State Power*, by Edward S. Corwin of Princeton University, treats the subject from an historical as well as a legal point of view (Holt).

Laird and Lee have published *Historic Americans*, in four volumes. The articles are by various hands.

We believe that few students of American history are aware of the extent and value of the collection of transcripts from the English archives which during the last seven years has been accumulated in the Division of Manuscripts at the Library of Congress. The lists in Professor Andrews's *Guides* are by this time wholly inadequate, additional volumes having been acquired with much rapidity. There are lists of accessions in each successive report of the librarian, but it is difficult to keep one's knowledge of the status up to date. It may suffice to say that any investigator needing to consult any given American paper in the British archives does well to inquire if there is not a transcript at Washington, for with characteristic liberality the library lends these transcripts.

Professor John S. Bassett of Smith College has just issued (Macmillans) *A Short History of the United States*, intended to serve either as a college text-book or for the general reader.

In a recent number of the *Dietsche Warande en Belfort* Dr. L. Van Der Essen of Louvain has an interesting general article on the recent progress and organization of historical work in the United States, entitled *Wetenschap in het Land der "Business Men"*.

*The Twenty-Eighth Annual Report of the Bureau of American Ethnology* (pp. 308, xxxv) is for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1907, but bears the imprint date 1912. The volume is made up principally of three papers, two by Dr. J. W. Fewkes, and one by Dr. Truman Michelson. Dr. Fewkes spent two winters conducting excavations in the Casa Grande and surrounding ruins in Arizona and reports the results of his observations in a paper occupying 150 printed pages, together with a history of the ruins from the time when Father Kino visited them in 1694, quoting at length from many writers. Dr. Fewkes's second paper is in the nature of a preliminary report upon the antiquities of the Upper Verde River and Walnut Creek Valleys, Arizona, and describes briefly a large number of ruins. Dr. Michelson's paper is a preliminary report on the Linguistic Classification of Algonquian Tribes. It is accompanied by an illustrative map prepared with the co-operation of Dr. John R. Swanton. Included in the volume is also a list of the publications of the Bureau (pp. 35).

Dr. Frederick A. Cleveland has written for the *American Citizen* series a volume entitled *Organized Democracy: an Introduction to the Study of American Politics*, which contains some slight historical studies as a basis for his analysis of present democracy.

*Deutsch-Amerikanische Geschichtsblätter*, hitherto published as a periodical by the German American Historical Society of Illinois, has now become an annual, edited by Professor Julius Goebel of the University of Illinois. The change supplies an organ for the publication of

larger monographs in the society's field than can be inserted in a magazine. Volume XII. (Chicago, the Society [1913], pp. 601) is marked especially by two such investigations: one by Professor Vincent H. Todd of Greenville College, on Christoph von Graffenried and the Founding of New Bern, the other by Professor Alexander Franz of Frankfurt, on "Die erste Deutsche Einwanderung in das Mississippital; eine kritische Würdigung"; also by an interesting mass of emigrants' letters of 1709, contributed by Professor Goebel, and other contents of value. The volume will deserve more extended notice.

In the May-August issue of the *German American Annals* Mr. Preston A. Barba continues his studies of the life and works of Friedrich Armand Strubberg and also presents a study of the American Indian in German Fiction. Mr. Charles F. Brede's papers on the German Drama in English on the Philadelphia Stage are continued.

In the *Records of the American Catholic Historical Society* for June Rev. E. I. Devitt, S. J., presents an account of Bohemia: Mission of St. Francis Xavier, Cecil County, Maryland. The life of Bishop Conwell of Philadelphia, by the late Martin I. J. Griffin, revised and edited by the Rev. Lemuel B. Norton, is continued.

In the March number of the *Magazine of History* Mr. Ralston Hayden discusses the apostasy of Silas Deane, examining in particular the question whether Deane was a paid agent of the British government. The *Magazine* prints a letter of James Fenimore Cooper (1848) relative to General Taylor and the presidency, and also one of James R. Mallory (March 22, 1861) touching upon his plans for the Confederate navy.

The Library of Congress has issued a *Select List of References on the Monetary Question*, compiled by H. H. B. Meyer and W. A. Slade.

The Government Printing Office has issued *Comparison of Customs Tariff Laws, 1789 to 1909 inclusive, and intermediate Legislation thereon, with statistical Tables of Imports and other Data*, in two volumes, prepared under the direction of the Senate Committee on Finance.

The *Year Book* of the Pennsylvania Society for 1913 includes some papers of historical interest: the Theory of Constitutional Government in 1787 and at the Present Time, by George W. Wickersham; the Constitution of the United States, by James Bryce; the States under the Constitution, by Job E. Hedges; and the United States: the People's Charter, by William E. Borah.

A print of the Constitution of the United States with the two new amendments, XVI. and XVII., *Senate Document No. 12*, 63 cong., 2 sess., may be obtained from the Superintendent of Documents for fifteen cents.

In the *History Teacher's Magazine* for September the leading article is a valuable and suggestive paper by Sir Charles P. Lucas, formerly of the British Colonial Office, entitled *The A B C of West Indian History*.

## ITEMS ARRANGED IN CHRONOLOGICAL ORDER

A cheap reprint of Las Casas's *La Destrucción de las Indias* together with Vargas Machuca's *Refutación de Las Casas* has recently been issued as a volume of the *Biblioteca Económica de Clásicos Castellanos* (Paris, Louis-Michaud, 1913).

Mr. A. Percival Newton of the University of London is the author of *The Colonizing Activities of the English Puritans: the Last Phase of the Elizabethan Struggle between England and Spain*, which is soon to be published in the series of *Yale Historical Publications*. The volume is mainly, but not exclusively, concerned with the Providence Island Company.

John T. Lee has published in the Wisconsin Historical Society *Proceedings* Captain Jonathan Carver: Additional Data, a study intended to disprove the judgment of Professor Edward G. Bourne published in this journal (XI. 287-302).

The Illinois State Historical Library has brought out the *George Rogers Clark Papers*, edited, with an introduction, by Professor James A. James.

The April issue of the *Ohio State University Bulletin* (pp. 50) is an interesting contribution to the history of the American Loyalists by Professor Wilbur H. Siebert, entitled the Legacy of the American Revolution in the British West Indies and the Bahamas. The fortunes of the Loyalists in East Florida and West Florida, and in Jamaica, the Bahamas, and some other islands, are followed minutely upon the basis of careful researches.

In the *Quarterly Journal of the University of North Dakota* for July Professor O. G. Libby presents a careful study of the Political Factions in Washington's Administration. The study is accompanied by analytical tables of votes in the House of Representatives during the first four Congresses.

The Yale University Press will publish Moreau de Saint Méry's *Diary of a Voyage to the United States*, edited by Professor Stewart L. Mims.

Houghton Mifflin Company announces *Harrison Gray Otis: his Life and Correspondence, 1765-1848*, by Samuel Eliot Morison. The work will be in two volumes.

*Oliver Hazard Perry and the Battle of Lake Erie*, by James C. Mills, is published in Detroit by John Phelps. The book is illustrated with pictures of battle scenes from old engravings.

In a well-prepared and well-indexed volume of 335 pages (Government Printing Office, 1913) the Library of Congress has issued a *Calendar of the Papers of John Jordan Crittenden*, nearly 2500 in number, preserved in the Division of Manuscripts. The range is from 1782, but chiefly from 1817, to 1864. Though most of the important letters of Crittenden, and many of those addressed to him, have already been printed in Mrs. Coleman's *Life*, the collection contains a great deal of good material illustrating general, Whig, and Kentucky politics, and especially the discussions of 1860 and 1861.

Henry Holt and Company have published a new and enlarged edition of Mrs. Caroline Cowles Richards Clarke's *Village Life in America, 1852-1872*, with an introduction by Margaret E. Sangster.

The lecture on *The Relation of Press Correspondents to the Navy before and during the War*, delivered by Mr. J. C. O'Laughlin at the Naval War College Extension in Washington in February last, has been published by the Government Printing Office.

The complete text of Professor J. G. Randall's treatise on *The Confiscation of Property during the Civil War*, of which a portion was printed in this journal (XVIII. 79-96) has been printed as a University of Chicago dissertation (pp. vi, 72).

*Hungarians in the American Civil War*, by Eugene Pivány, illustrated by John Kemény, is a booklet of about 60 pages reprinted from *Dongó*, an Hungarian magazine published in Cleveland. Although the Hungarians in the Union army were few compared with those of some other nationalities, their services were nevertheless notable. For instance, we find among them two major-generals, five brigadier-generals, fifteen colonels, two lieutenant-colonels, thirteen majors, and twelve captains. The book includes sketches of the principal officers as well as accounts of the services of the Hungarian troops.

Houghton Mifflin Company will publish this autumn *Bull Run; its Strategy and Tactics*, by Professor R. M. Johnston of Harvard University.

*War Experiences and the Story of the Vicksburg Campaign from "Milliken's Bend" to July 4, 1863* (pp. 64), "being an accurate and graphic account of campaign events" taken from the diary of Captain J. J. Kellogg, of Company B, 113th Illinois volunteer infantry, has been published in Washington, Iowa, by the *Evening Journal*.

*The Battle of Gettysburg* (pp. 462), by Rev. J. B. Young, a participant, has been published by Harper and Brothers.

*James S. Wadsworth of Geneseo*, by Professor Henry G. Pearson, comes from the press of Charles Scribner's Sons. General Wadsworth is



treated as a political leader in New York, as a military commander, and as military governor of Washington.

Mrs. La Salle Corbell Pickett has brought out through Messrs. Lippincott a new edition of *Pickett and his Men*, the biography of her husband, General George E. Pickett, whose division made the famous Confederate charge on the third day of the battle of Gettysburg.

*The Heart of a Soldier as revealed in the intimate Letters of General George E. Pickett, C. S. A.*, has been brought out in New York by Seth Moyle.

*The second William Penn: a true Account of Incidents that happened along the old Santa Fé Trail in the Sixties* is the title of a small book by the hand of W. H. Ryus and from the press of F. T. Riley Publishing Company of Kansas City.

Dr. James Schouler will soon publish a seventh volume of his well-known *History of the United States*, entitled *The Reconstruction Period, 1865-1877* (Dodd, Mead, and Company).

*The Granger Movement: a Study of Agricultural Organization and its Political, Economic, and Social Manifestations, 1870-1880*, by Dr. Solon J. Buck, is announced by the Harvard University Press.

*The Americans in the Philippines*, by the late James A. Le Roy, with an introduction by President Taft, will be published shortly by Houghton Mifflin Company. Mr. Le Roy, during his life-time a valued contributor to this journal, was private secretary to Judge Taft when the latter was chairman of the commission for governing the Philippine Islands, and in that and other official positions had, and used to the full, the best opportunities for knowing the history of the American occupation.

#### LOCAL ITEMS, ARRANGED IN GEOGRAPHICAL ORDER

Houghton Mifflin Company has brought out the second volume of the *History of Belfast, Maine*, by Joseph Williamson. The volume covers the period from 1875 to 1900.

*A History of the Baptists in Vermont* (pp. 700), by Henry Crocker, has been brought out in Bellows Falls by P. H. Gobie.

The Massachusetts commissioner of public records has issued in a pamphlet (Boston, 1913, pp. 21) *The Laws relating to the Public Records and Public Documents, with the Opinions of the Attorneys-General*.

The February-March fascicle of the Massachusetts Historical Society's *Proceedings* contains a paper of Mr. Charles Francis Adams on Sectional Feeling in 1861, embodying a portion of the correspondence of William Howard Russell printed in the London *Times* but omitted from Russell's published volume, *My Diary, North and South*; a long

letter from Donald Campbell to John Hancock in 1787; a number of letters to and from Francis Baylies, 1828-1830 (one of 1821), pertaining to politics and political conditions; some letters of George Sumner, brother of Charles Sumner, 1837-1844; and a letter of David Thomas to Griffith Evans, 1789, concerning a local election. In the April-May serial Professor MacDonald develops an interesting point respecting the Indebtedness of John Marshall to Alexander Hamilton in respect to the doctrine of implied powers. There are also some interesting letters of Salma Hale respecting Monticello and Jefferson in 1818 and a letter of 1756 of John Adams to Charles Cushing. The June issue is chiefly marked by an elaborate paper of Mr. Winslow Warren on the Colonial Customs Service in Massachusetts in its Relation to the Revolution.

The American Antiquarian Society, in the first of a series of occasional *Bulletins* lists important recent acquisitions of Southern newspapers, among them a file of the *Alexandria* (Virginia) *Gazette* from 1800 to 1910.

The Rhode Island Historical Society has recently received as a gift from the Talbot family a volume of manuscripts, some fifty in number, embracing the commissions and correspondence of Commodore Silas Talbot.

*A Political History of the State of New York, 1865-1869*, by Dr. Homer A. Stebbins, is one of the recent numbers of the *Columbia University Studies* (vol. LX., no. 1)

Volume XVII. of the *Publications* of the Buffalo Historical Society, which is now in press, will contain an account of the exercises at the semi-centennial of the society, with some of the addresses delivered on that occasion, and much other matter relating to the history of Buffalo.

The January issue of the *Proceedings of the New Jersey Historical Society* includes a paper by Dr. John R. Stevenson on "The Councils of Proprietors of New Jersey"; a continuation of Mr. William M. Mervine's account of John Anderson, sometime president of His Majesty's council of New Jersey, and his descendants; a memorial (about 1731) in behalf of the children of William Burnet; and some documents (1735-1736) relating to the separation of New Jersey from New York. The two items last mentioned are both taken from the *Eleventh Report* of the Royal Historical Manuscripts Commission.

Professor Allen C. Thomas has brought out through D. C. Heath and Company *A History of Pennsylvania* (pp. 312).

Mrs. Hester D. Richardson has brought out through Williams and Wilkins Company of Baltimore *Side-Lights on Maryland History; with Sketches of Early Maryland Families*. The work is in two volumes.

Volume 16 of the *Records of the Columbia Historical Society* contains accounts of the mansion and family of Motley Young, by George C. Henning, of the history of the Washington city library, by William De Caidry, of the emancipation of the slaves in the District of Columbia, by Rev. Page Milburn, and of the erection of the White House, by Mrs. Abby G. Baker.

The *Ninth Annual Report* of the Library Board of the Virginia State Library, to which is appended the ninth annual report of the state librarian (pp. 50), has appeared. Of particular interest is the report of the department of archives and history, wherein are noted the accessions of manuscripts. Two considerable bodies of papers have been acquired, the papers (about 30,000 pieces) of J. K. Martin, a pension attorney residing in Richmond in 1850 and subsequently, and the letters (about 25,000) of William Allason and Company, a firm of Scottish merchants doing business at Falmouth, Virginia, from 1760 to 1800. Among the accessions are also numerous papers of the Revolutionary period. It is also noteworthy that the library has arranged its considerable collection of maps and made them available. Bound with the report is a *List of the Revolutionary Soldiers of Virginia* (pp. 335), supplementary to the list printed in connection with the report of the library for the year 1911. This list is a special report of the department of archives and history, prepared by H. J. Eckenrode, archivist. The list now printed is drawn for the most part from the records in the War Department at Washington.

The Virginia State Library has issued as *Bulletin*, vol. VI., no. 2, *A List of the Portraits and Pieces of Statuary in the Virginia State Library, with Biographical Notes*, compiled by Earl G. Swem. The list contains only the titles of portraits in oils, excluding engravings, lithographs, and photographs, which it is intended at some future time to make the subject of a separate bulletin. In addition to the printed sources the compiler has availed himself of manuscripts and newspapers in the library, and has also gathered much information through correspondence and conversation with friends and relatives of those represented in the collection.

The July issue of the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* includes a continuation of the commissions and instructions to the Earl of Orkney for the government of Virginia (from the Randolph manuscript); a number of documents pertaining directly or indirectly to Bacon's Rebellion; several council papers, among them: an order in regard to letters of denization (1699), instructions from the Lords of the Admiralty to the governors of Virginia (June 21, 1700), instructions in regard to trials (August 1, 1700), and a letter from the Board of Trade and Plantations to the governor of Virginia (August 21, 1700). The *Magazine* resumes the publication of the list of Sussex County wills (M to W, principally of the period 1754-1804), and continues the

minutes of the council and general court (1624), from the originals in the Library of Congress, as also the Revolutionary army orders for the main army under Washington, 1778-1779.

*The Free Negro in Virginia, 1619-1865*, by Dr. John H. Russell of Allegheny College (*Johns Hopkins University Studies*, vol. XXXI., no. 3, pp. 194), treats of such topics as the distribution, the origin, and the legal and social status of the free negro.

The *John P. Branch Historical Papers of Randolph-Macon College*, vol. IV., no. 1, comprises a biography of Governor John Floyd (1783-1837), by J. M. Batten; one of Bishop John Early (1786-1876), by J. Rives Childs; one of Philip P. Barbour (1783-1841), by P. P. Cynn, a Corean; sketches of the sons of Governor John Floyd, from the manuscript of Senator John W. Johnston; and some letters (1844), principally to Thomas Ritchie, pertaining to Virginia's attitude toward the Texas question.

The June *Bulletin* of the New York Public Library prints a body of papers, mostly letters from North Carolina in 1798, relating to the estate in North Carolina of Samuel Cornell (1731-1781), who in 1775 had been the richest merchant of the colony, and to the efforts of his heirs to recover the estate after its confiscation by the loyalist act of 1779.

In the April number of the *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine* Mr. Henry A. M. Smith continues his studies of the baronies of South Carolina with a description of Hobcaw barony. The register of St. Andrews Parish and the order book of John Faucheraud Grimké are continued in this number and also in that of July, which contains in addition an article on the Brisbane family, by E. H. Hillman, and one on Some Forgotten Towns of Lower South Carolina, by H. A. M. Smith.

The Georgia Historical Society has issued *Letters of Joseph Clay, Merchant of Savannah, 1776-1793*, and a *List of Ships and Vessels entered at the Port of Savannah for May, 1765, 1766, and 1767*.

*The History of Georgia Methodism from 1786 to 1866*, by Rev. G. G. Smith, has been published in Atlanta by A. B. Caldwell.

*A History of the German Element in Texas from 1820 to 1850*, etc., by M. P. G. Tiling, has been brought out in Houston by the author.

Volume XIII. of the *Publications* of the Mississippi Historical Society (University, Miss., 1913, pp. 326) is devoted to the history of reconstruction in four counties of Mississippi: Panola, by John W. Kyle; Scott, by Forrest Cooper; Lafayette, by Miss Julia Kendel; and Oktibeha, by F. Z. Browne—counties typical of the different agricultural regions of the state, and for the most important of which—Pinola and Scott—ample materials were available.

The July number of the *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* contains part II. of Professor I. J. Cox's study of the Louisiana-Texas Frontier, part I. of which was published in vol. X. of the *Quarterly*. This issue includes also the diary of Rev. W. Y. Allen, who resided in Texas from March, 1838, to February, 1842, and was for a time chaplain to one or other house of the congress of the Republic. The diary, which covers the period from March to December, 1838, and the first half of October, 1839, was originally published in the *Texas Presbyterian* at intervals in 1880-1883. It is edited by William S. Red. New Light on Manuel Lisa and the Spanish Fur Trade is a contribution of Professor Herbert E. Bolton and includes a letter of Manuel Lisa, dated September 8, 1812, given in translation as well as in the original. The correspondence from the British archives concerning Texas, edited by Professor E. D. Adams, covers the period from May to August, 1843.

Professor Archibald Henderson of the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C., has been for some time collecting information toward a biography of Daniel Boone. He would be glad to receive information respecting appropriate material in private hands or in public collections other than the Draper, Durrett, and Emmet collections.

*The Democratic Party of the State of Ohio: a comprehensive History of Democracy in Ohio from 1803 to 1912*, etc., in two volumes, edited by T. E. Powell, has been issued by the Ohio Publishing Company of Columbus. The work includes biographical sketches of the Democratic governors of Ohio and also of the leading Democratic politicians.

The principal contents of the January number of the *Journal of the Illinois State Historical Society* are a history of the great seal of Illinois, by Brand Whitlock; a description of Fort Crèvecoeur, by Arthur Lagron, formerly an officer of engineers of the French army; Recollections of the War between the States, by Major Henry C. Connelly; the Services of Richard Yates to Public Education, by Edmund J. James; Recollections of the Lincoln-Douglas Debate held in Alton, Illinois, October 15, 1858; and Recollections of the Assassination and Funeral of Abraham Lincoln, by Edmond Beall; Some Traits of Judge Silas L. Bryan, father of William Jennings Bryan (reprinted from the *New York Tribune*, April, 1900), by Rufus Cope; and four letters, from Jesse B. Thomas (1820), J. H. Pugh (1825), Benjamin Mills (1825), and George Forquer (1830), respectively, written to P. P. Enos. The July number contains the annual address, "Benjamin Lundy, Pioneer of Freedom", delivered before the society in May, by George A. Lawrence; a paper concerning the plans of the Illinois State Historical Library with special reference to the care of Public Archives, by Professor E. B. Greene; a letter from E. B. Washburne (dated, Paris, December 15, 1874) to John Dixon; and the annual report of the secretary, Mrs. Jessie Palmer Weber.

The Wisconsin History Commission has two volumes in press: *Narrative of Service with the Third Wisconsin Infantry*, by Major Julian

W. Hinkley, and *Civil War Messages and Proclamations by Wisconsin Governors*. The *Diary of an Artillery Private*, by Rev. Jenkin Lloyd Jones, is being edited for the commission by the editorial staff of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin.

The bound volume of the *Proceedings* of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin for the year 1912 has come from the press. Of the principal historical papers included in the volume some notice has already been given in the preceding number of this journal (p. 881). The index to vols. I. to XX. of the society's *Collections* is in course of preparation and will be issued as soon as vol. XX., which is now in press, shall have appeared.

Mr. Charles B. Richards, who, under a commission from the governor of Iowa, was in charge of the defense of the frontier of that state in 1857, 1858, and 1859, gives an account in the April issue of the *Annals of Iowa* of the Organization and Service of the Frontier Guard. In this issue of the *Annals* is printed a journal kept by A. W. Harlan on a journey from Athens, Missouri, to California, May 1 to September 17, 1850.

In the July number of the *Iowa Journal of History and Politics* Mr. Louis Pelzer discourses upon History made by Plain Men. Episodes in the Early History of the Western Iowa Country is a contribution of Mr. Jacob Van der Zee after an investigation of practically all available sources and a careful weighing of conflicting and confusing statements. Mr. Clifford Powell, in his history of the codes of Iowa law, gives a history of the code of 1897.

The *Missouri Historical Collections*, vol. IV., no. 2, contains a sketch of Judge Wilson Primm (1810-1878), by W. C. Breckenridge, who also edited for this number of the *Collections* a sketch of the early history of St. Louis written by Judge Primm. Under the caption "Ezekiel Williams's Adventures in Colorado" is reprinted a letter of Ezekiel Williams published in the *Missouri Gazette* of September 14, 1816. Williams is supposed to have been the third American to visit the Colorado country, having come a few years later than Pike. The editor of the *Collections* writes an introduction to the letter.

Mr. A. E. Sheldon, director of the Nebraska Legislative Reference Bureau, has brought out through the University of Chicago Press *History and Stories of Nebraska*, with maps and illustrations.

Bulletin 54 of the Bureau of American Ethnology bears the general title *The Physiography of the Rio Grande Valley, New Mexico, in Relation to Pueblo Culture*, and comprises three separate papers, the result of co-operative work on the part of the School of American Ethnology and the Bureau of American Ethnology. Mr. Edgar L. Hewett, director of the former, gives a general physiographic description of the Rio

Grande valley, Professor Junius Henderson of the University of Colorado describes the geology and topography, and Professor Henderson jointly with Professor W. W. Robbins of the same institution discusses the climate and the evidence of climatic changes.

*The Official Correspondence of James S. Calhoun while Indian Agent at Santa Fé and Superintendent of Indian Affairs in New Mexico*, collected mainly from the files of the Indian Office and edited, under its direction, by Dr. Annie Heloise Abel, associate professor of history in Goucher College, will be published before long by the Indian Office. The work is in two parts, part I. comprising the correspondence of Calhoun as first Indian agent of the United States at Santa Fé, 1849-1851, and part II. his correspondence as first territorial governor of New Mexico and ex-officio superintendent of Indian affairs, 1851-1852.

*The Colorado River Campaign, 1781-1782: Diary of Pedro Fages*, edited by Herbert Ingram Priestley, is one of the recent publications of the *Academy of Pacific Coast History*.

In the January issue of the *Washington Historical Quarterly* O. B. Sperlin offers some account of the exploration of the Upper Columbia in 1810-1811 by David Thompson, the astronomer and geographer, drawn from Thompson's journal, preserved in the ministry of lands and forests in Toronto; Leo Jones gives a résumé of the proposed amendments to the state constitution of Washington; and Allen Weir writes a sketch of William Weir, who, as an employee of the Missouri Fur Company, explored the Oregon Country in 1809. In the issue for April Professor Frank A. Golder presents a Survey of Alaska, 1743-1799; Camilla Thompson Donnell, a pioneer, who settled at The Dalles in 1858, writes of Early Days at White Salmon and The Dalles; and Guy V. Bennett of Early Relations of the Sandwich Islands to the old Oregon Territory. The July issue includes some extracts, contributed by George W. Soliday, from logs, narratives, and journals of American seamen, explorers, traders, and travellers in the Oregon territory and the Pacific Northwest pertaining to Independence Day; the Story of Three Olympic Peaks, by Professor Edmond S. Meany; and a letter from John Tyler to his son, dated December 23, 1845. The reprinting of Wilkes's *History of Oregon* continues.

The *Quarterly of the Oregon Historical Society* for December, 1912, contains a paper by Mr. Clarence B. Bagley on the Transmission of Intelligence in Early Days in Oregon; the journal of John Work, covering the Snake River expedition, 1830-1831, edited by T. C. Elliott; some letters of Rev. and Mrs. H. H. Spalding, written after the completion of a journey across the continent, in 1836; a letter of James W. Nesmith, written from Oregon City in June, 1845; and a letter of Sir George Simpson to Archibald McKinlay, June 25, 1848, with an introductory note by T. C. Elliott.



Mr. Hubert Howe Bancroft has brought out a revised edition of his *New Pacific*, although the revision falls short of bringing the story quite down to date.

Mr. E. H. Adams of Brooklyn, New York, is the author and publisher of *Private Gold Coinage of California, 1849-1855, its History and its Issues* (pp. 110).

The Archives of the Dominion of Canada issued no annual report for 1911. That for 1912, just published, is a volume of 295 pages. It contains as appendixes several calendars of special collections—of the correspondence of General James Murray, 1759-1791, of that between the Sardinian ministers at London and Paris in 1761-1763 (the Count de Viry and the Bailli de Solar), and of Bishop Inglis of Halifax, 1775-1814; fuller abstracts of the papers in the first eleven volumes of "Correspondance Politique, États-Unis", at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Paris; and the full texts of important documents relative to Anglo-French relations in 1629-1633 and to the Port Royal expedition of 1710. Among the acquisitions are the papers of Joseph Howe. Three volumes of much historical interest are announced: a second volume of *Constitutional Documents*, a volume of documents relating to prairie legislation, and one of documents on the War of 1812.

Volume X. of the *Papers and Records of the Ontario Historical Society* is occupied with papers read at last summer's meeting of that society at Napanee. Mr. J. A. Macdonell's paper on Sir Isaac Brock, Dr. Thwaites's address on Romantic Elements in the History of the Mississippi Valley, Dr. Frank H. Severance's excellent article on Collections of Historical Material relating to the War of 1812, and Professor Adam Shortt's discerning paper on the Economic Effect of that War on Upper Canada, are especially worthy of mention.

Pierre Georges Roy has collected in a little volume some historical, biographical, and descriptive notes relating to *L'Église Paroissiale de Notre-Dame de la Victoire de Lévis* (Lévis, 1912, pp. 296). What Mr. Roy has done for one of the parish churches of Lévis, opposite Quebec, might well be done for every local church, whether Catholic or Protestant, even though, as in this case, the volume could have naught but a local interest.

No. 69 (August, 1913) of *International Conciliation* is a sketch of the relations of Brazil with the United States, by Manoel da Oliveira Lima, Brazilian minister to Belgium.

Noteworthy articles in periodicals: Ch. de la Roncière, *L'Origine du Vineland* (Annales de Géographie, May 15); H. Vignaud, *Des Thèses Nouvelles sur l'Origine de Christophe Colomb: Espagnol? Juif? Corse?* (Revue Critique d'Histoire et de Littérature, May 3); C. Sanz Arizmendi, *Cuatro Expediciones de Juan Haquines (John Hawkins)*, (Boletín del Instituto de Estudios Americanistas de Sevilla, March);

L. de Laigue, *Un Missionnaire Lorrain au Canada sous Louis XV.* [Father Rasle] (*Revue Générale*, 1913, 1); W. C. Fisher, *The Tabular Standard in Massachusetts History* (*Quarterly Journal of Economics*, May); L. Didier, *Le Citoyen Genet*, conclusion (*Revue des Questions Historiques*, April); Homer Lea, *The Legacy of Commodore Perry* (*North American Review*, June); Hiram Bingham, *The Monroe Doctrine* (*Atlantic Monthly*, June); Gamaliel Bradford, jr., *Judah P. Benjamin* (*ibid.*, June); *id.*, *Alexander H. Stephens* (*ibid.*, July); *id.*, *Robert Toombs* (*ibid.*, August); E. I. McCormac, *Two Ideals of Government in American History* (*University of California Chronicle*, April); Demangeon, *Les Relations de la France du Nord avec l'Amérique: Esquisse de Géographie Commerciale* (*Annales de Géographie*, May 15); John Boyd, *The Birth of the Dominion; with personal Reminiscences of Sir Charles Tupper* (*Canadian Magazine*, July); G. Latorre, *La Revolución é Independencia de Méjico*, I. (*Boletín del Instituto de Estudios Americanistas de Sevilla*, March).